

## SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 19, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, May 2, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, very great yet very near, in whom we live and move and have our being, let not our callousness make Thy presence unreal to us. Wherever goodness is, or truth, or beauty, there Thou art. Make sensitive our spirits that, knowing Thy grace and power, we may be cleansed and strengthened.

We thank Thee for human love which at its best bears witness to Thee and evermore keeps faith and hope alive in the world. With all our imperfections and fallible judgments, grant unto us a compassion for others which understands and pities and forgives. Strengthen and steady us by the memory of men who have gone on to certain defeat, and even to certain destruction, with causes which deserved and were destined to triumph. Undergird us, we pray, with that glorious vision of eternal values which have supported men who were seeking ends too great to be reached in their own lifetime.

We ask it, O Father of our spirits, who hath been our dwelling place in all generations, in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, in whom Thou hast freely given us all things. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 17, 1955, was dispensed with.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—  
APPROVAL OF BILL

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 13, 1955, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1094) to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954.

## REPORTS OF PANAMA CANAL COMPANY AND CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message

from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying reports, was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

## To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the third annual report of the Panama Canal Company and the Canal Zone Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 19, 1955.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 14. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Austin, Travis County, Tex., to the State of Texas;

S. 128. An act for the relief of Francis Bertram Brennan;

S. 143. An act for the relief of Kurt Glaser;

S. 148. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Polk County, Iowa, and described as Camp Dodge and Polk County Target Range, to the State of Iowa;

S. 163. An act for the relief of Philoplin Michalopoulos (Mihalakopoulos);

S. 271. An act for the relief of June Rose McHenry;

S. 386. An act for the relief of Sandra Lea MacMullin;

S. 409. An act for the relief of Inge Krarup;

S. 416. An act for the relief of Anastasia Alexiadou;

S. 653. An act to provide for the conveyance of Jackson Barracks, La., to the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes;

S. 734. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, section 871, to provide penalties for threats against the President-elect and the Vice President;

S. 891. An act for the relief of Chokichi Iraha;

S. 941. An act to amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal land banks to purchase certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation;

S. 1133. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay indemnity for losses and expenses incurred during July 1954 in the destruction, treatment, or processing, under authority of law, of swine, swine carcasses, and products derived from swine carcasses, infected with vesicular exanthema;

S. 1413. An act to amend the act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts; and

S. 1705. An act for the relief of George Paul Khouri.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1650) to authorize the Territory of Alaska to obtain advances from the Federal Unemployment Act, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of

the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 957. An act for the relief of Dr. Cristjo Cristof, his wife Jordana Dlova Cristof, and his children George and Daphne-Kremena Cristof; and

H. R. 1012. An act for the relief of Federico Ungar Finally.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bill and joint resolution of the House:

H. R. 1328. An act for the relief of Nicholas John Manticas, Anne Francis Manticas, Yvonne Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas; and

H. J. Res. 211. A joint resolution to confer jurisdiction on the Attorney General to determine the eligibility of certain aliens to benefit under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 245. An act to amend section 2 of the act of January 27, 1905 (33 Stat. 616), as amended (48 U. S. C. 1952 edition, sec. 322);

H. R. 603. An act to amend the act of January 21, 1929, which relates to the grant of additional land for the support and maintenance of the University of Alaska;

H. R. 625. An act to provide for the adjustment of tolls to be charged by the Wayland special road district No. 1 of Clark County, Mo., in the maintenance and operation of a toll bridge across the Des Moines River at or near Saint Francisville, Mo.;

H. R. 899. An act to authorize and direct the sale of certain land in Alaska to Oscar H. Vogel, of Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 926. An act for the relief of Bruno Michael Kiuru;

H. R. 928. An act for the relief of Eugenio Maida;

H. R. 988. An act for the relief of Susanne Fellner;

H. R. 990. An act for the relief of Takako Riu Reich;

H. R. 1034. An act for the relief of Erwin S. DeMoskoni;

H. R. 1060. An act for the relief of Grace Casquite Hwang;

H. R. 1145. An act for the relief of Ora L. Powers;

H. R. 1217. An act for the relief of Evagelos B. Tzarmas;

H. R. 1218. An act for the relief of Mira Domenika Grgurinovich;

H. R. 1405. An act for the relief of Vassiliki D. Papadakou;

H. R. 1406. An act for the relief of Sister Antonina Zattolo and Sister Antonina Call;

H. R. 1407. An act for the relief of Henry Kraemer;

H. R. 1408. An act for the relief of Caterina Ruello;

H. R. 1415. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Frederick Redmond;

H. R. 1461. An act for the relief of Helen E. Cox;

H. R. 1495. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Porter;

H. R. 1503. An act for the relief of Helga Kutschka;

H. R. 1504. An act for the relief of Andreas Kafarakis;

H. R. 1508. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Perouz Derderian Donaldson;

H. R. 1651. An act for the relief of Lucette Helene Adams;

H. R. 1802. An act to authorize the leasing of certain lands of the Yakima Tribe to the State of Washington for historical and for park purposes;

H. R. 1868. An act for the relief of Ernest Tomassich and Yoko Matsuo Tomassich;  
 H. R. 1869. An act for the relief of Luis Deriberprey;  
 H. R. 1897. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Tumbarello;  
 H. R. 1912. An act for the relief of Howard Rieck;  
 H. R. 1929. An act for the relief of Eufemia Benclch;  
 H. R. 1935. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Curro Tati;  
 H. R. 1962. An act for the relief of Miss Athena Kitsopoulou;  
 H. R. 1964. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hildegard Herrmann Costa;  
 H. R. 2338. An act for the relief of Charles F. Bullette;  
 H. R. 2360. An act for the relief of Gloria Fan;  
 H. R. 2528. An act for the relief of Mrs. Josette L. St. Marie;  
 H. R. 2682. An act relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation;  
 H. R. 2768. An act for the relief of Charles R. Law, Jr.;  
 H. R. 2769. An act for the relief of Tennessee C. Batts;  
 H. R. 2984. An act authorizing E. B. Reyna, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Los Ebanos, Tex.;  
 H. R. 3024. An act for the relief of Margaret Mary Hammond;  
 H. R. 3194. An act for the relief of E. S. Berney;  
 H. R. 3268. An act for the relief of Comdr. George B. Greer;  
 H. R. 3354. An act for the relief of Julius G. Watson;  
 H. R. 3786. An act to authorize the incorporation of Army and Navy Legion of Valor of United States of America;  
 H. R. 3813. An act to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine eligibility for membership therein;  
 H. R. 3825. An act to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over certain land in the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass.;  
 H. R. 3867. An act for the relief of Iwan Bonk and Tacianna Bonk;  
 H. R. 3878. An act to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended, pertaining to emergency flood-control work;  
 H. R. 3964. An act for the relief of Kingan, Inc.;  
 H. R. 3972. An act for the relief of Anthony Marinus Kronenburg;  
 H. R. 4198. An act for the relief of Howard L. Gray;  
 H. R. 4294. An act to amend section 640 of title 14, United States Code, concerning the interchange of supplies between the Armed Forces;  
 H. R. 4359. An act to amend the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1096), to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Richmond, Calif.;  
 H. R. 4573. An act authorizing Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;  
 H. R. 4650. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code by the addition of provisions authorizing regulation of the sale and use of fireworks in the Canal Zone;  
 H. R. 4753. An act to amend subsection (e) (1) of section 13A of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to change from 2 years to 3 years the standard contained therein with respect to the past affiliations of individuals conducting the management of certain organizations;  
 H. R. 4754. An act to redefine eligibility for membership in AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II);

H. R. 4778. An act to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department and mail clerks of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4791. An act to amend section 40 of the Bankruptcy Act, so as to increase salaries for part-time and full-time referees;  
 H. R. 4853. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Pacific Northern Timber Co.;

H. R. 4902. An act for the relief of Martin F. Kendrigan;

H. R. 5146. An act to authorize the President to promote Paul A. Smith, a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey on the retired list, to the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, with entitlement to all benefits pertaining to any officer retired in such grade;

H. R. 5224. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to authorize certain early discharges of enlisted personnel, and preserve their rights, privileges, and benefits;

H. R. 5300. An act to authorize the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5389. An act for the relief of Alfred J. Stahl;

H. R. 5398. An act to increase the efficiency of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5417. An act to amend section 1721, title 18, United States Code, relating to the sale or pledge of postage stamps;

H. R. 5456. An act for the relief of Emil Arens;

H. R. 5494. An act for the relief of Ivan N. Burlingame, and others;

H. R. 5633. An act for the relief of John L. Boyer, Jr.;

H. R. 5634. An act for the relief of Willie C. Pickett, George Williams, and Herman L. Looney;

H. R. 5635. An act for the relief of Dr. Woldemyr Fedyniak and others;

H. R. 5787. An act to authorize settlement of claims for residential structures heretofore erected at the expense of patients on the grounds of the Public Health Service hospital, Carville, La.;

H. R. 5809. An act for the relief of A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc.;

H. R. 5841. An act to repeal the fee stamp requirement in the Foreign Service and amend section 1728 of the Revised Statutes, as amended;

H. R. 5842. An act to repeal a service charge of 10 cents per sheet of 100 words, for making out and authenticating copies of records in the Department of State;

H. R. 5860. An act to authorize certain officers and employees of the Department of State and the Foreign Service to carry firearms;

H. R. 5907. An act for the relief of Albert Woolson; and

H. R. 6043. An act to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the maintenance of the Merchant Marine Academy.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens;

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; and

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 957. An act for the relief of Dr. Cristof Cristof, his wife Jordana Diloza Cristof, and his children George and Daphne-Kremena Cristof;

H. R. 1012. An act for the relief of Federico Ungar Finaly; and

H. R. 1328. An act for the relief of Nicholas John Manticas, Anne Francis Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas.

## HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

H. R. 245. An act to amend section 2 of the act of January 27, 1905 (33 Stat. 616), as amended (48 U. S. C. 1952 edition, sec. 322);

H. R. 603. An act to amend the act of January 21, 1929, which relates to the grant of additional land for the support and maintenance of the University of Alaska;

H. R. 899. An act to authorize and direct the sale of certain land in Alaska to Oscar H. Vogel, of Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 1802. An act to authorize the leasing of certain lands of the Yakima Tribe to the State of Washington for historical and for park purposes;

H. R. 2682. An act relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation;

H. R. 4853. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Pacific Northern Timber Co.; and

H. R. 5300. An act to authorize the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 625. An act to provide for the adjustment of tolls to be charged by the Wayland Special Road District No. 1 of Clark County, Mo., in the maintenance and operation of a toll bridge across the Des Moines River at or near St. Francisville, Mo.; and

H. R. 3878. An act to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended, pertaining to emergency flood control work; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 926. An act for the relief of Bruno Michael Kluru;

H. R. 928. An act for the relief of Eugenio Maida;

H. R. 988. An act for the relief of Susanne Fellner;

H. R. 990. An act for the relief of Takako Riu Relch;

H. R. 1034. An act for the relief of Erwin S. DeMoskonyi;

H. R. 1060. An act for the relief of Grace Casquite Hwang;

H. R. 1145. An act for the relief of Ora L. Powers;

H. R. 1217. An act for the relief of Evagelos B. Tzarimas;

H. R. 1218. An act for the relief of Mira Domenika Grgurinovich;

H. R. 1405. An act for the relief of Vasili D. Papadakou;

H. R. 1406. An act for the relief of Sister Antonina Zattolo and Sister Antonina Call;

H. R. 1407. An act for the relief of Henry Kraemer;

H. R. 1408. An act for the relief of Caterina Ruello;

H. R. 1415. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Frederick Redmond;

H. R. 1461. An act for the relief of Helen E. Cox;

H. R. 1495. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Porter;



H. R. 1503. An act for the relief of Helga Kutschka;  
 H. R. 1504. An act for the relief of Andreas Kafarakis;  
 H. R. 1508. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Perouz Derderian Donaldson;  
 H. R. 1651. An act for the relief of Lucette Helene Adams;  
 H. R. 1868. An act for the relief of Ernest Tomassich and Yoko Matsuo Tomassich;  
 H. R. 1869. An act for the relief of Luis Deriberprey;  
 H. R. 1897. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Tumbarello;  
 H. R. 1912. An act for the relief of Howard Rieck;  
 H. R. 1929. An act for the relief of Eugenia Benich;  
 H. R. 1935. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Curro Tati;  
 H. R. 1962. An act for the relief of Miss Athena Kitsopoulou;  
 H. R. 1964. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hildegard Herrmann Costa;  
 H. R. 2338. An act for the relief of Charles F. Bullette;  
 H. R. 2360. An act for the relief of Gloria Fan;  
 H. R. 2528. An act for the relief of Mrs. Josette L. St. Marie;  
 H. R. 2768. An act for the relief of Charles R. Law, Jr.;  
 H. R. 2769. An act for the relief of Tennessee C. Batts;  
 H. R. 3194. An act for the relief of E. S. Berney;  
 H. R. 3268. An act for the relief of Comdr. George B. Greer;  
 H. R. 3786. An act to authorize the incorporation of Army and Navy Legion of Valor of United States of America;  
 H. R. 3813. An act to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine eligibility for membership therein;  
 H. R. 3867. An act for the relief of Iwan Bonk and Tacianna Bonk;  
 H. R. 3964. An act for the relief of Kingan, Inc.;  
 H. R. 3972. An act for the relief of Anthonius Marinus Kronenburg;  
 H. R. 4753. An act to amend subsection (e) (1) of section 13A of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to change from 2 years to 3 years the standard contained therein with respect to the past affiliations of individuals conducting the management of certain organizations;  
 H. R. 4754. An act to redefine eligibility for membership in AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II);  
 H. R. 4791. An act to amend section 40 of the Bankruptcy Act, so as to increase salaries for part-time and full-time referees;  
 H. R. 4902. An act for the relief of Martin F. Kendrigan;  
 H. R. 5389. An act for the relief of Alfred J. Stahl;  
 H. R. 5417. An act to amend section 1721, title 18, United States Code, relating to the sale or pledge of postage stamps;  
 H. R. 5456. An act for the relief of Emil Arens;  
 H. R. 5494. An act for the relief of Ivan N. Burlingame and others;  
 H. R. 5633. An act for the relief of John L. Boyer, Jr.;  
 H. R. 5634. An act for the relief of Willie C. Pickett, George Williams, and Herman L. Looney;  
 H. R. 5635. An act for the relief of Dr. Wolodymyr Fedyniak, and others;  
 H. R. 5787. An act to authorize settlement of claims for residential structures heretofore erected at the expense of patients on the grounds of the Public Health Service hospital, Carville, La.;  
 H. R. 5809. An act for the relief of the A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc.;  
 H. R. 5907. An act for the relief of Albert Woolson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2984. An act authorizing E. B. Reyna, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Los Ebanos, Tex.;

H. R. 4573. An act authorizing Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 5841. An act to repeal the fee stamp requirement in the Foreign Service and amend section 1728 of the Revised Statutes, as amended;

H. R. 5842. An act to repeal a service charge of 10 cents per sheet of 100 words, for making out and authenticating copies of records in the Department of State; and

H. R. 5860. An act to authorize certain officers and employees of the Department of State and the Foreign Service to carry firearms; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. R. 3024. An act for the relief of Margaret Mary Hammond;

H. R. 3354. An act for the relief of Julius G. Watson; and

H. R. 4198. An act for the relief of Howard L. Gray; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 3825. An act to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over certain land in the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass.;

H. R. 4294. An act to amend section 640 of title 14, United States Code, concerning the interchange of supplies between the Armed Forces; and

H. R. 4650. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code by the addition of provisions authorizing regulation of the sale and use of fireworks in the Canal Zone; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4359. An act to amend the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1096), to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Richmond, Calif.;

H. R. 5146. An act to authorize the President to promote Paul A. Smith, a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey on the retired list, to the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, with entitlement to all benefits pertaining to any officer retired in such grade;

H. R. 5224. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to authorize certain early discharges of enlisted personnel, and preserve their rights, privileges, and benefits;

H. R. 5398. An act to increase the efficiency of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6043. An act to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the maintenance of the Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4778. An act to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department and mail clerks of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 98) approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress approves the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of*

section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (67 Stat. 403; 68 Stat. 1044):

A-7118684, Chen, Jeanne Kuo-Cheng.  
 A-7790096, Chou, I-Kua.

A-6958664, Hsi, Eugene Yu-Cheng.  
 A-6848000, Hsi, Eugenia Min-I (nee Huang).

A-6965690, Keh, Shou-bing (Alfred).  
 A-6845060, Lee, Kul-Lung (Cecelia).

A-6703299, Lee, Tsai Hwa.  
 A-6967575, Liu, Yung-Szi (Frances).

A-6589958, Tsien, Vee Chang.  
 E-079901, Chong, Kwai or Kwai Chong Chung.

E-092370, Tan, Tommy Sie-Chang.  
 A-6620717, Dunn, Lily Wen-Yuen Fong.

A-6564145, Fok, Ruth Louise (nee Shen Hsun-Lan) also known as Ruth Louise Hsun-Lan Sung.  
 A-6851384, Hsia, Chih Tsing or Hsia Chih Tsing.

A-6403564, Hu, Shengen.  
 T-1144534, Shew, Jimmie Chu Ting.

A-6457337, Tchou, Montchen Tu-Tsang  
 0300-217753, Ting, Anna.

A-6008482, Ting, Sheng.  
 A-6760595, Wen, Richard Yutze.

A-4468478, Chiu, Katherine Yu (nee Tseng).

A-6435876, Chu, Esme Yun-Yun.  
 A-6691415, Nieh, Eunice Chen Yu.

A-6623014, Ying, Lu Lan.  
 A-6171334, Chiang, Pang Sun.

A-6851604, Chung, William Y.  
 A-6457476, Pan, Chi-Hsun.

A-6847923, Pan, Kay.  
 A-6403565, Shen, Constance Ming Chung.

A-6699858, Tai, Hsia Tao or Tao Tay Hsia.  
 A-6148143, Tang, Harry Kong Hung also known as Kong-Hung Tang.

0300-455922, Tung, Cheng Yu.  
 A-6847794, Woo, Dah-Cheng.

A-6848709, Young, Frank Kuankiang.  
 A-7414876, Chang, Che-Tyan.

A-6844259, Chu, Power Young Chao.  
 A-6769936, Bittar, Evelyn Edward or Bit-tar, E. Edward.

A-6522835, Chu, John Wen-djang aka Chu, Wen Djung.

0200-130593, Hsia, David Yi-Yung.  
 0200-130594, Hsia, Hsio-Hsuan (nee Shih).

A-6421076, Jung, Angela Chih-Ying.  
 E-5755, Kaasik, Harald.

E-6688266, Teitelbaum, Tauba Raca.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 99) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):*

A-7125281, Berend, Peter Mihaly, or Peter Michael Berend.

0300/370564, Boon, Lim Jew.  
 A-7849663, Brieze, Roberts Martins.

A-7849664, Brieze, Milda Hermine.  
 A-9555132, Chan, Si Heung.

0300/43030, Chen, Chen Ah.  
 A-6052568, Chen, Lin or Chen Lin.

0300-27496, Chen, Mrs. Susie or Cheng Shun Fan.

A-9766040, Chit, Ho Fung.  
 A-8031725, Chiu, Teng Hoik or Ting Hsieh Chow or Chow Ting-Hsieh or Hsieh Ting Chiu.

A-6851319, Chow, Marie Patrice or Kwang Hua Chow.

A-7073707, Chow, Tseng Kam.  
 A-9658660, Dong, Ng Eng.

0300/387990, Fong, Ho Wah.  
 A-8057994, Foo, Sin or Foo Sin.

- A-6779040, Frankel, Edwin Nessim.  
A-6819141, Hajduszewski, Tadeusz.  
A-6970000, Hayya, Jacob.  
A-6962959, Ho, Frank Hung Fal.  
A-9661887, Ho, Lim Gat.  
0300/390670, Huen, Kwai Chuen.  
A-7863034, Kadegls, Arvids Gustavs.  
A-7863033, Kiss, Eduard.  
0300-402141, Kok, He Schiek or Schiek He Kok.  
A-6788959, Kringelis, Teodors Andrejs.  
A-6788960, Kringelis, Austra.  
A-6788961, Kringelis, Daina.  
A-6788962, Kringelis, Imants.  
A-6634875, Krol, Kazimierz Julian.  
A-9669192, Kum, Lay.  
A-6843498, Lee, Mary Min Chen.  
0300/80416, Lee, Yee Kow.  
A-7249066, Liepa, Janis.  
A-9682636, Man, Seld.  
0300-134639, Mao, Henry Shu-Tsing.  
A-6379854, Mei, Chu Chow Ah.  
A-6794934, Mitri, Moise Hanna.  
A-6971771, Pikkil, Miralda (see Pihl).  
A-7204903, Rod, Anna Agnes (nee Kukol).  
A-6848225, Shen, Frederick Albert.  
A-8196650, Shim, Chong.  
0300-420528, Siang, Sung Chan.  
A-7249064, Sturmanis, Karlis.  
A-6965379, Tashkovich, Gligor Tashko.  
A-6848676, Ting, Lu.  
A-7129774, Tsai, Poo Hubbert.  
A-7863001, Ulmanis, Ludvigs.  
A-7249880, Valm, Mihkel.  
A-7250165, Valm, Alekse.  
A-7249882, Valm, Theodor.  
A-9802613, Yick, Tong.  
A-6967695, Yin, Huo-Bing.  
0300-83569, Ying, Chan.  
A-9542543, Yu, Ling Tao or Lum Tow EE.  
A-8082386, Yuen, Chan Kam or Chan Hong Kow.  
A-6703490, Zee, Robin Joseph or Zee Yao-Shun.  
0300-397560, Cheung, Wah or Cheung Wah.  
0300-427936, Chow, Chung Shan.  
0300-390908, Hon, Kong or Hon Kong.  
A-8082075, Kwan, Wu Sing.  
A-6971768, Soaar, Voldemar.  
A-6971757, Soaar, Hela (nee Feder).  
A-6910014, Lokiec, Majer.  
A-8039688, Tsai, Sung Chu.  
0300/29659, Chan, Ah Hoe.  
0300-418043, Chan, Cheung Yuk or Chan Yuk Cheung.  
A-9687373, Chan, Tim.  
0300-370929, Cheng, Bou Ching or Mu Bou Ching Ching.  
A-6972945, Cheng, Pauline Ming-Hung.  
174/736, Cheong, Mong.  
A-9533428, Ching, Mark.  
A-9687173, Chiu, Loo or Lo Chin.  
A-8039173, Fok, Lam.  
0300-400335, Fong, Lee.  
A-6936267, Geiger, George.  
A-6936268, Geiger, Ella (nee Spielman).  
0300-423621, Hin, Wong Sui or Wong Kin.  
A-6965180, Hsu, Chien Hwai or Jay Hsu.  
A-6965179, Hsu, Jiu Hwai or Mal Hsu.  
A-6958731, Janovitz, Serena (nee Simon).  
A-6971749, Kaevando, Roman.  
A-6971748, Kaevando, Helmi (nee Lents).  
A-8015625, Kam, Cheung or Cheung Wuen.  
A-6692899, Kramar, Branko.  
A-6910269, Kramar, Maria.  
A-6985975, Kulp, Karel.  
A-6971798, Lepp, Alekse.  
A-6971759, Lepp, Agathe (nee Hanslep).  
A-6888878, Lien, Din Shiang.  
0300-66727, Linic, Vladimir.  
A-9782777, Loo, Sam Teer.  
A-6772581, Maksimovs, Eriks or Maximovs.  
A-6917065, Maksimovs, Michells or Mikels Maksimovs.  
A-6670578, Pang, Yee.  
A-7135610, Perl, Lazar.  
A-9765644, Piccini, Francesco.  
A-6955590, Pulauskas, Matas.  
A-7809727, Shak, To or Doo Sat.  
0300-400854, Shing, Lo Kam.  
A-7849428, Silins, Adolfs Janis.  
A-7849429, Silins, Maija Alexandra.  
A-7849430, Silinis, Junior, Adolfs.  
A-7084933, Sipos, Marianne Margaret Kertesz.  
A-9804295, Suurna, Mihkel.  
A-9561923, Tee, Toon Hue.  
A-6307394, Tom, Gong or Tom Gong or Tom Shing.  
A-9533429, Tong, Shing or Chung Shing or Tom Shing or Chung Chuen.  
A-8258584, Too, Fung or Too Fung.  
A-8082014, Toong, Cha Chiang or Toong Chue Ching or Peter Chue Ching Toong.  
A-8091339, Tuum, Aleksander Villem.  
A-6967364, Wang, John Y.  
A-6851357, Wang, Richard I-Hsiang.  
A-7476304, Yao, Ting Hui or Michael T. H. Yao.  
A-9507456, Yow, Choy or Choy You.  
A-7292642, Boldyreff, Antonina (nee Zhigmanovsky).  
A-7292641, Boldyreff, Helen or Helene.  
A-8082841, Chen, Yen or Chen Yi Shi or Yi Shi Chen.  
0300-24950, Chojnaki, Eugeniusz.  
A-7210403, Christopoulos, Yoanna Khamis or Jeanette Christou Christopoulos.  
A-6971650, Erdi, Anthony or Antal.  
A-9647005, Fang, Pow Foo.  
0300-97188, Fook, Tsang Koon.  
0300-424088, Fu, Quo or Pang Choy.  
A-6775569, Hlavac, Frantisek Josef.  
A-7073610, Hlavac, Marta.  
A-8082037, Huang, Mary Sei Mei.  
A-6830536, Irani, Joseph Isaac or Joseph Irani.  
A-6899364, Kazimierski, Stanley.  
A-7863216, Kesteris, Mikelis.  
A-7863217, Kesteris, Ilze.  
A-7863218, Kesteris, Andres.  
A-9836636, Lian, Shin Ah.  
A-6851636, Lin, Julius Yun-L.  
0300/408693, Moy, Young.  
A-7084232, Petraitis, Juczas or Joseph Petraitis.  
A-7243875, Stencavs, Kristis.  
A-7244305, Stencavs, Augusts.  
A-6704110T, Sun, Pao-Chih or Paulette Pao-Chi Sun.  
0300-402447, Teng, Wong Gee or Wong Kee.  
A-6851366, Tien-Jan, John Paul Ly.  
175/651, Wan, Lam.  
A-9778441, Wei, Toh Chung.  
A-8065346, Wei, Wang Ah or Wang Ah Vee.  
A-6851523, Yang, Thomas Meng Ping.  
A-9731090, Ching, Pang.  
A-7863027, Eidok, Walter.  
A-9644600, Fal, Cheung.  
A-7087608, Fasko, Daniel.  
A-9764648, Lewandowski, Julian.  
0300-399882, Ng, Tou.  
A-6986534, Odella, Sister Mary (ll Feng-yu).  
A-7863008, Ritums, Janis.  
A-7248809, Salme, Karl.  
A-9633107, Skkratic, Dragutin Pranjko.  
A-7863203, Stendzis, Janis.  
A-7863204, Stendzis Ilze Pusaudze.  
A-7863205, Stendzis, Imants Arvids.  
A-6929742, Tan, Dianalhue Kao.  
0300-373583, Wong, Ah King or Wang Ken Sing.  
A-6044499, Woo, Sze Lu Hsiang.  
A-8078864, Yao, King Fah.  
A-8050321, Blascovich, Attilio.  
A-7095908, Bogacki, Wacław Zdzisław.  
A-8082842, Bors, Tibor Eugen.  
A-7975432, Boucher, Arsene Andre.  
A-6967730, Chen Wen Pin.  
A-6904310, Cheng, Chang Sin.  
0300-417793, Chong, Fong or Chong Fong.  
A-6986509, Chu, Sister Mary Dulcia.  
A-6522833, Chu, Wei Liang.  
A-7863026, Elzis, Aleksandrs.  
A-7356380, Frankel, Maurice Solomon.  
A-7863031, Galvans, Peteris.  
A-8091397, Gega, Anthony John.  
A-7863032, Gorbants, Imants.  
A-9782690, Hee, Wong.  
A-7354351, Huang, Shao Chi.  
A-9703852, Kam, Mak or James Mak.  
A-6848646, Kao, Rose Tse Ching.  
0300-403722, Kee, Shum.  
A-7095531, Kersna, Johannes Maks.  
A-7095532, Kersna, Salme.  
A-9573456, King, Ho Ah.  
A-9196442, Kirs, Alexander.  
A-7204900, Krno, Ladislav Gejza.  
A-7204901, Krno, Katherine.  
T-1144870, Krno, Katherine Tatiana.  
A-7873848, Kum, Chow.  
A-7048906, Laupa, Armas.  
A-6812186, Lenart, Leslie Oscar.  
A-7863225, Lidums, Rudolf.  
A-7863227, Lidum, Olaf Rudolf.  
A-5971242, Liu, San Koon or Liu San Koon.  
A-6854454, Luca, George or Gheorghe.  
A-6854456, Luca, Elena.  
A-9684344, Lung, Shung Sin or Chung Sin Lung.  
A-9825451, Magic, Zdenko.  
A-7138009, Matusoff, Ethel.  
A-7223209, Mejzr, Miroslav.  
A-7223210, Mejzr, Ruzena.  
T-2645007, Mejzr, Miroslava Marie.  
A-7193990, Mejzr, Ivanka.  
A-7802065, Petersons, Karlis.  
A-6971770, Pihl, Eduard.  
A-6971772, Pihl, Lildia.  
A-9765057, Polushin, Walter John or Viacheslav Ivanovitch Polushin.  
A-6405622, Rashin, Louis Nathan.  
A-6703361, Shie, Wei Wu.  
A-6855586, Shie, Susan Ding Neh (nee Wang).  
A-7193991, Spitz, Ruzena.  
0300-396920, Sufich, Giovanna.  
A-9554379, Sul, Lui or Liu.  
A-7975174, Surian, Luca.  
T-1144528, Velcich, John.  
0300-289791, Viacich, Ferruccio.  
A-6851354, Wang, Chou-Chiu or Gordon Wang.  
A-6881707, Yang, Chi.  
A-8065847, Yau, Loo.  
A-6949354, Zee, Tsong Ngo or Ah Neng.  
A-6589294, Aboddy, Reuben Moshi.  
A-9948302, Canaletich, Mario Giorgio.  
A-6709262, Chang, Yuan Chun.  
A-6171208, Chen, Kwei Sen.  
0300-280451, Chen, Mes Chih Ping.  
A-7879678, Chen, Thomas.  
A-6970307, Chen, David.  
0300-424485, Chen, Peter.  
A-7955258, Chmielewska, Maria.  
A-6988894, Chuck, Lou Yuen or Low Yean Choe.  
A-7243252, Creglia, Giordano.  
A-6971766, Esberg, Adele.  
A-6971765, Esberg, Jutta.  
A-8021324, Fatutta, Marco.  
A-8065726, Fong, Wong or Fong Wong.  
A-7249077, Freimanis, Theodore Genrichs.  
A-7249076, Freimanis, Anna Elena Olga.  
A-6263402, Gartenszteig, Israel.  
A-8031589, Ha, Tsong Tong or Tsong Tung Ha.  
A-6971758, Hilesalu, Endel.  
A-7366483, Hsueh-Yung, Shu or Evan Hsueh-Yung Shu.  
A-6660388, Hu, Tsei Suan.  
A-7283198, Inventarz, Izak.  
1100-29956, Kao, Yun-Chen or Mary Yun-Chen Kao or Mary Kao.  
A-8082033, Kenul, Marcello.  
A-8031384, Kow, Ng Kung.  
A-6966542, Kutty, Frances.  
A-6978177, Lederman, Pejsach or Pejsach Lederman Grezelak or Paul Lederman.  
A-6690537, Lee, Han Duck or Henry Lee.  
A-6690619, Lee, Tom Shee or Tom Kim Hing.  
A-7056802, Loh, Tsau Yueh or Thomas Y. Lowe.  
V-305539, Mih, Alexander Wei-Shan.  
A-9782737, Ming, Tung.  
A-6971802, Oja, Harry.  
A-6971796, Oja, Rugh.  
A-8065366, Pomason, Stefano.  
A-2823761, Radulich, Mate.  
A-7178411, Reinvald, Manivald.  
A-8001335, Rubinch, Joseph.  
A-7873098, Runco, Anthony.  
A-7095534, Savisaar, Elmar Johannes.



A-7095535, Savisaar, Armilda Kolik.  
 A-7095536, Savisaar, Atso.  
 03000-418127, Sepcich, John.  
 A-9770642, Shi, Chang or Fred San.  
 A-6904332, Sipajlo, Jiri.  
 A-7809912, Strmecki, Josip.  
 A-7941177, Szubert, Konrad Joseph.  
 A-9765493, Tamm, Heinmar.  
 A-6887270, Tang, Michael Tsien-Chien.  
 A-6448741, Tsu, John Bosco or Bing Ming Tsu.  
 A-9245758, Yiu, Young.  
 A-6704228, Zak, Helena or Sister Mercita Evita.  
 A-7095021, Brody, Alexander.  
 A-6712046, Fok, Dso Yun.  
 A-9559819, For, Leung or Leung Kai.  
 A-9799220, Hop, Chu or Chew Hop.  
 A-8039680, Jurasic, Angelo or Iurasich.  
 0300-387739, Kam, Sheh.  
 0300-245055, Kasser, Elizabeth Aranyi.  
 0300-245055, Kasser, Ivan.  
 0300-245055, Kasser, Mary.  
 A-9623303, Ko, Lee King or Lee Kam Ho.  
 0300-12942, Leong, Sing To.  
 A-7483853, Simcha, Helene (nee Rosenberger).  
 T-666654, Soo, John Yun-Chun.  
 A-6816885, Spitzka, Aloisia.  
 A-4039059, Toll, Friedrich Alexander.  
 A-8106037, Tong, Tsang.  
 0300-409250, Tsai, Ah San.  
 A-6694159, Weissbart, Esther Vera (nee Blinchevsky).  
 A-6847895, Chow, Ho.  
 0300-405869, Foo, Lee or Lee Wai Foo.  
 0300-408016, Fook, Lee.  
 A-6938801, Grive, Ansis.  
 A-9553994, Hing, Lee Ah.  
 A-9544110, Koel, Valdemar.  
 A-7126610, Lee, Ted Teh-Yuan.  
 A-9684355, Liu, Huo Shin or Fok Lau.  
 A-9529877, Mai, Lee-Shing.  
 A-7052332, Markovits, Salomon.  
 A-7138329, Markovits, Iiona (nee Weisz).  
 A-6974328, Meisels, Martin.  
 A-7139340, Shaw, Julia Chang.  
 A-7297278, Steinmetz, Abraham.  
 A-6933818, Stern, Tibor.  
 A-6953157, Sulyok, Dezzo Karoly.  
 A-6970438, Sulyok, Etelka.  
 A-9571956, Tak, Lee.  
 A-8091549, Vosilla, Angelo, Otavio.  
 A-6858256, Wen, Peter Liang.  
 A-6694209, Wen, Amy Tang.  
 A-6028252, Wong, Yun Jee.  
 A-7074880, Yeh, Te Fung.  
 A-7874913, Celich, Frank.  
 A-9765153, Donatich, Giuseppe.  
 0300-429047, Fong, Lee Tsi.  
 A-6735483, Hallac, Joseph Paul.  
 0300-413098, Hing, Lo.  
 A-6578981, Kozarski, Danilo Zivko.  
 A-6640338, Szor, Leopold.  
 A-6345116, Szor, Irena Philipp.  
 A-8039682, Tsai, Hong Ping or Ping Tsai Hong.  
 A-8021319, Babenko, Gennady Konstantinovitch.  
 0300-387987, Chan, Hong Kong or Chan Pui.  
 A-9231941, Chew, Tan Sing.  
 A-7366302, Chu, Pan.  
 A-7383067, Garbin, Luka Eduard.  
 A-6499962, Hirsch, Nathan Alfred.  
 A-7128158, Illich, Sofia.  
 A-6851658, Kao, Chi Tsing.  
 A-7128158, Illich, Sofia.  
 A-6851658, Kao, Chi Tsing.  
 A-7849673, Kleinbergs, Mile Anete.  
 A-8082060, Lubich, Mario.  
 A-7849671, Ozolins, Armins.  
 0501-19752, Pe-Kuang, Patrick or Pe-Kuang Tseng.  
 A-6971769, Peters, Juuli.  
 A-8065425, Shih, Shio Nia or Shia Nia Shih.  
 0300-421797, Sing, Wang or Wong Park.  
 A-6848091, Tan, Ying Chun.  
 A-6938807, Tipans, Vallja (nee Ievins).  
 A-6887732, Tsao, Shu Yun Tseng (nee Shu Yun Tseng).

A-7056816, Tuzar, Jaroslav.  
 A-7358945, Tuzar, Jirina.  
 A-8015056, Tuzar, Jana.  
 0500-33535, Wimmer, Katalin.  
 A-6986573, Wong, Kau Sau or Kai Sau Wong.  
 A-7383351, Yang, Samuel Hsueh-Lun.  
 A-7383352, Yang, Hsiu-Hwa.  
 A-7283009, Borsic, Aladar.  
 A-6371814, Choi, Ho Liang.  
 0300-405913, Chong, Yun or Cheung Wan.  
 A-7350611, Chow, Chung Lee or Ven Sih Chow.  
 A-6320011, Chu, Choy.  
 A-7189791, Dambos, Kostas.  
 A-7243855, Fridmanis, Imants Egons.  
 A-7243067, Fridmanis, Erika Uptie.  
 A-7138432, Grabowski, Bronislaw.  
 A-9501262, Grandke, Telesfor.  
 A-6952325, Grunfeld, Juda.  
 A-6857659, Habbab, Abdulghani Joseph.  
 0300-379350, Hah, Ng.  
 A-9686792, Kin, Chan.  
 A-7061800, Koci, Vaclav.  
 A-6971809, Kukk, Verner Reinhold.  
 A-6971810, Kukk, Fronelly Franziska.  
 A-6971777, Kukk, Harald.  
 A-9551611, Lung, Ben or Long.  
 A-8091360, Mon, Lum.  
 A-7244196, Nagy, Ivan Gabor.  
 0400/54441, Raicovich, Giuseppe.  
 0300-92577, San, Lum Hong or Chow King Fen.  
 0300-410615, Sang, Tsang.  
 A-8082091, Scaliordick, John or Giovanni Sgalordich.  
 A-9560203, Sing, Foo Wah or Foo Wah Teng.  
 A-7138246, Sturm, Jolana Judita.  
 A-6381281, Tien, Sheue Fung or Arthur Whitfield or Stanley Tien.  
 A-9513949, Wai, Nam.  
 A-6624918, Woo, Henry Kyi-Oen.  
 A-6971805, Wosa, Aino Adele or Aino Adele Riks or Aino Adele Edal.  
 A-7961771, Wosa, Oscar Adolf.  
 A-9705521, Yee, Ho or Yee Ho.  
 A-8091322, Yee, Sang Fon or Yee Sing or Yu Hsing.  
 0300-422039, Yow, Ng or Ng Yin.  
 A-7244303, Akmans, Marta Emiliola.  
 A-7992859, Chew, Chan formerly Chan Shing Jow.  
 A-7457745, Foo, William Er Chen.  
 A-7249874, Kermon, Rudolf.  
 A-9733412, Kong, Ngo Ying.  
 A-6958636, Lin, Chao-Han.  
 A-6849918, Liu, Chia-Lo.  
 A-1903522, Liu, I. Hsin.  
 A-9744381, Toong, Ding Yao.  
 A-7138447, Winternitz, Jenta.  
 A-7120716, Balassa, Bela.  
 A-7170116, Balassa, Ida Bogyor.  
 A-6301049, Cerven, George.  
 A-6792244, Chang, Sing Chen or Sing Chen Chang.  
 A-7197313, Chang, Chien Wei Lan or Chien Wei Lan or Chang Lah Chien Wei.  
 A-7197314, Chang, Chung Yung or Judy Yung Chang or Judy Chung Yung Chang.  
 A-9635195, Che, Leong.  
 A-6163714, Ho, Lien Yu.  
 A-7395257, Ho, Yin Hwa Cheng.  
 A-7395258, Ho, Henry Nieuhan.  
 A-7395259, Ho, Stephen Shianoling.  
 A-7395260, Ho, Barbara Beeyuan.  
 A-7395261, Ho, Margaret Yustang.  
 A-6674633, Komarek, Vit.  
 A-7398466, Krizanova, Maria.  
 0300-416920, Li, Sheng Sen.  
 A-6026376, Lo, Arthur Wu-Nien.  
 A-6403589, Lo, Elizabeth Heng-Hui Shen.  
 T-1892157, Loy, Too.  
 A-6935169, Mok, Charlie or Mak Wee.  
 A-8282626, Sung, Zee Hu.  
 A-6847853, Tyau, Louise (nee Shu-Chiu Luan).  
 A-6847962, Wang, Yu Chiang or Richard Y. C. Wang.  
 A-6453829, Albrecht, Marie Neumannova.  
 A-7210188, Barta, Tibor.  
 A-6798984, Briedis, Arturs.

A-7087346, Chuh, Sharlin or Sharlin Charlie Chuh.  
 A-9569306, Foo, Wong Kia.  
 A-6849448, Guang, Mann-Lo or Michael Kan.  
 A-6971789, Hyvonen, Alice Uustalu.  
 A-6851462, Kiang, Lu Yu.  
 A-7171983, Knauer, Eugenie formerly Strakaty (nee Petersen) or Indra Devi.  
 0400/47451, San, Yao Chin.  
 A-7202554, San, Vera.  
 A-7202882, San, Sio Chu.  
 A-7205703, Wong, Sio Yu San.  
 A-7202553, San, Yu Lan.  
 0400/54495, San, Yu Lin.  
 A-7178373, Sarapik, Evert.  
 A-9825044, Splawinski, Franciszek.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 110) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):*

A-9540876, Andra, Ervin Rudolf.  
 A-8057219, Bacchia, Ermanno.  
 T-2786643, Bain, Hong Yuan.  
 A-9512692, Bang, Cheung or Cheung Ping.  
 A-9825169, Barulich, Antonio.  
 A-7186356, Basch, Marton.  
 A-6207921, Bistreff, Stanu Salvov.  
 A-6207920, Bistreff, Eugenia.  
 A-7538670, Chang, Yi-An Rosita.  
 0300/419969, Ching, Ah.  
 A-8082325, Chung, Cheng.  
 0300-396020, Chung, Shin or Shiu Chung.  
 E-094561, Ding, Sing Yoh.  
 A-6969986, Fabian, George Stephen.  
 A-9678368, Fat, Wong or Wong Man.  
 176/484, Foo, Yee King.  
 A-8082056, Fook, Lo.  
 A-7351309, Gruenberg, Dora.  
 A-9749483, Heinsar, Meinhard or Heinsaar.  
 A-9686736, Hop, Leung.  
 A-7779095, Hung, Chung Shu or Francis C. S. Hung.  
 A-6971746, Huva, Walter.  
 A-6971747, Huva, Leili.  
 A-4191741, Kaminski, Kazmer or Kazmierz.  
 A-7863018, Kancans, Edgar Arnolds.  
 A-9575626, Kaneps, Peter Voldemars or Peteris Voldemars Kaneps.  
 A-6967285, Kao, Evelina Tse-Ven.  
 A-9139291, King, Chin or Chan Kin.  
 0300-396806, Koo, Lee Young.  
 A-7133274, Ku, Min-Chuan.  
 A-4760478, Lee, Ching-Ye (nee Ling).  
 A-8117995, Lee, Tong.  
 A-7064133, Li, Ching Po.  
 A-6017699, Liang, Vi Kang or Wei Kang Liang.  
 0300-405868, Ling, Ah Fook.  
 A-6849848, Ling, Linda Chiu Huang.  
 A-6703496, Lo, Yu-Cheng.  
 A-6703484, Lo, Woo-Lih Lena Dunn.  
 A-6962954, Loh, Arthur Tsung Yuan.  
 A-6041575, Lowe, Donald Ming-Dah.  
 A-7046279, Marton, Tibor William or Mayer or Tibor Marton or M. T. Marton.  
 A-7200780, Mascitelli, Teresa (nee Tobolik).  
 A-9731869, Ming, Chan Choy.  
 A-7879331, Mintz, Samson or Szymson Minc.  
 A-9825225, Morin, Silvestro.  
 0300-18256, Nee, Kai Sung.  
 A-9518299, Neng, Tan Jee or Tan Gee Ning.  
 A-9577665, Olman, Karl.  
 A-7371655, Paczosa, Marja.  
 A-7975173, Pien, Pao Chi.

0501-19744, Hu, Yu Ming.  
 A-8031504, Ping, Lai or Lal Pyee.  
 A-9290467, Poa, Tan Ki.  
 A-6756976, Potasz, Judith.  
 0300-304535, Raczyński, Wacław.  
 A-6393475, Rajczyk, Szmul Dawid.  
 A-9554180, Sai, Leong Kee.  
 A-5869957, Sang, Tsang.  
 A-6887953, Sefcik, Ludvik Tom or Louis H. Sefcik.

A-8091316, Sen, Tek or Fu Theh Shin.  
 A-8082001, Shah, Victor Stephen.  
 A-8091356, Sing, Leung.  
 A-8106036, Song, Lim Shi.  
 A-9609271, Soon, Jong.  
 A-7849432, Steinbergs, Juris.  
 A-7849433, Steinbergs, Velta (nee Brieze).  
 A-7849427, Steinbergs, Marija (nee Labovskiy).  
 A-7074013, Straka, Marie.  
 A-7886251, Straka, Karel Alex.  
 A-7061816, Sununu, Alfred Saleh.  
 A-7991591, Szabo, Senior, Thomas P.  
 A-7991592, Szabo, Eva Agres (nee Vicenty).  
 A-7991593, Szabo, Thomas, Jr.  
 A-7991594, Szabo, Adam.  
 A-9561964, Sze, Chen Tek.  
 A-7095904, Szonyi, Giselle.  
 A-6971787, Tischler, Albert.  
 A-6971783, Tischler, Vilma.  
 A-8001228, Tom, Hay or Og Tom or Toy Loo or Choy Loo.  
 A-9529438, Tsou, Fong Shi.  
 A-6938806, Virdzenieks, Niklavs.  
 A-9810517, Virkebau, Uno or Wirkebau.  
 A-8082068, Wai, Lee.  
 A-6041703, Wu, Nelson Ikon.  
 E-094562, Wun, Choy or Won Sang or Wan Sang.  
 A-8039752, Yang, Lee Ah.  
 A-9677800, Yap, Lee Eng or Yap Eng Lee.  
 A-9571659, Yeh, Lau.  
 A-6952737, Yuen, Yee Sin.  
 A-6967543, Liu, Chin Po.  
 A-6967507, Liu, Dah Wen.  
 A-9525198, Kovacevic, Mitar.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 17, 1955,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, on May 18, 1955, signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H. R. 1573. An act to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; and

H. R. 5239. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on May 18, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1006. An act to authorize the execution of agreements between agencies of the United States and other agencies and instrumentalities for mutual aid in fire protection, and for other purposes; and

S. 1763. An act relating to the extension and the final liquidation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

#### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Senate

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Farm Credit Administration Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

#### DEATH OF GUY E. IVES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is with extreme regret that I announce to the Senate the death of a Senate official who has served this body faithfully and loyally for 43 years.

Guy E. Ives, the Senate printing clerk, passed away at his home last night from a heart attack. Thus ended a career in the Senate that started April 9, 1912, when Guy Ives began as an elevator operator.

I believe that all of us knew Mr. Ives personally and respected him deeply. Since April 20, 1921, he has been the Senate printing clerk, and whole generations of Senators have found the path smoothed before them by Guy Ives' willingness to use his skill and his experience in the Senate's service.

His hard, painstaking work has meant greater efficiency and greater effectiveness. It has speeded the preparation of the reports and the documents which afford the basis of Senate action.

I knew Guy Ives very well. I first became acquainted with him during my previous service as chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. He was willing to go to any lengths to meet the difficult task of preparing the printing of our reports—as we wanted them, how we wanted them, and when we wanted them.

The passing of such an able Senate official leaves us all with a feeling of deep sorrow. But it can truly be said in consolation for the loved ones he left behind that he earned the gratitude of all of us, and that he was a loyal and faithful servant of his country.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to join in the remarks made by the distinguished majority leader regarding the passing of a veteran Senate employee, Mr. Guy Ives. All of us have recognized the service he has given to the Senate, faithfully and well, over many years. I am sure the majority leader was speaking for the entire Senate and for Members on both sides of the aisle when he made the remarks he just uttered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the distinguished minority leader.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Howard F. Vultee, of New Jersey, to be Director, Office of Economic Affairs, United States mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European regional organizations.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably a group of 6,109 routine nominations in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, in grades from second lieutenant and ensign to lieutenant colonel and lieutenant commander. Included in the Air Force group are 140 West Point cadets and 185 Annapolis midshipmen for appointment as second lieutenants in the Regular Air Force. All of these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar of this large group, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. From the Committee on Armed Services, I also report favorably the nomination of Lt. Gen. Williston B. Palmer for promotion to four-star general under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act. General Palmer will occupy the position of Vice Chief of Staff, replacing General Bolte, and I ask that his nomination be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

#### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William C. Farmer, of Kansas, to be United States attorney for the district of Kansas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Marvin B. Miller to be commissioned ensign.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.



The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

#### ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the customary morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business, subject to the usual 2-minute limitation on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

##### AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT

A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 (Public Law 598, 83d Cong.) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

##### RENEWAL OF LEASE OF ANNETTE ISLAND AIRPORT TO THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize renewals of a lease of the Annette Island Airport to the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Appropriations:

##### "House Memorial 2

"Memorializing Congress to appropriate funds necessary to carry out the contracts between generating and transmission cooperatives financed by the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Southwestern Power Administration and to do all in its power to encourage and further public power in the area served by Southwestern Power Administration

"Whereas it has come to the attention of the House that there is growing pressure in Washington, D. C., seemingly emanating from the Interior Department, to discontinue the use of the Southwestern Power Association by using economic pressures to force the generating and transmission cooperatives to deal with private utilities instead of the Southwestern Power Administration; and

"Whereas the proposed new rate schedule of the Southwestern Power Administration is said to be undermining the very purpose of public power by making it impossible for the generating and transmission cooperatives to negotiate economical contracts for peaking power; and

"Whereas the original idea of the Southwestern Power Administration was to make available the maximum quantities of energy to cooperative and other preference customers and ultimately to make power available to the largest possible number of consumers at the lowest rate consistent with good business policy: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to appropriate money for the furtherance of the Southwestern Power Administration, and to enact any and all laws consistent with the public-power policy of the United States to make power available to all who need and demand it; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this memorial be immediately transmitted by the chief clerk of the house to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member of the Congress from the State of Missouri, and to the chairmen of the Appropriations Committees of both the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States.*

*"Adopted May 16, 1955.*

*"AUSTIN HILL,  
"Chief Clerk."*

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Appropriations:

##### "Senate Joint Resolution 6

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States to provide sufficient funds for immediate completion of the Jim Woodruff lock and dam and certain other projects on the Chattahoochee, Flint, and Apalachicola Rivers

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has authorized a public works project to improve the Chattahoochee, Flint, and Apalachicola Rivers in Florida, Georgia, and Alabama; and

"Whereas two phases of this project are now under construction: the Jim Woodruff lock and dam on the Apalachicola River at Chattahoochee, Fla., and the Buford Dam on the Chattahoochee River at Buford, Ga.; and

"Whereas there are three additional phases of the project for which construction funds have not been provided; namely, the channel in the Apalachicola River between the Intracoastal Waterway near Apalachicola, Fla., and the Jim Woodruff lock and dam, the Columbia lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River near Columbia, Ala., and the Fort Gaines lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River near Fort Gaines, Ga.; and

"Whereas each phase must be completed in its entirety before maximum use can be realized and the cost-benefit ratio be obtained as established by the United States Engineers; and

"Whereas the 2 million Americans living in the river valley will be greatly benefited if an accelerated construction program is adopted whereby all approved phases of the authorized project are placed on a simultaneous construction status: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby requested to provide sufficient construction moneys to continue construction of the Jim Woodruff lock and dam, the Buford Dam and to commence construction on the Apalachicola River channel, the Columbia lock and dam, and the Fort Gaines lock and dam, during the next fiscal year, July 1, 1955, to July 1, 1956; be it further*

*"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States; to the President of the United States Senate; to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives; to each of the ablest congressional delegation in the United States Congress, the Alabama delegation; to the Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers, Washington, D. C.; to each of the Governors of the States of Florida, Alabama and Georgia; and to the president of the Three Rivers Development Association, the Honorable Jim Woodruff, Sr., Columbus, Ga.*

*"J. E. SPEIGHT,  
"Secretary of Senate."*

A resolution adopted by the city court of the city of Buffalo, N. Y., relating to Polish independence; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the St. Matthew's Holy Name Society, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record and appropriately referred a concurrent resolution of the South Carolina Legislature memorializing the Congress to enact legislation that will secure to the States their right to collect certain sales taxes on purchases of private contractors executing Government contracts.

The case of *Kern-Limerick, Inc., v. Scurlock* (347 U. S. 110) appears to preclude the States from collecting such taxes in the future. To give such sweeping immunity to this revenue source of the States will work a tremendous hardship on at least 32 States having a sales tax. In certain States the effect of this decision might be to cause them, under their present tax structure, to operate at a deficit.

This is another Supreme Court decision that is not to be taken lightly. The implications of this decision can have grave consequences to our States and to our Nation. Let us act now to halt this process. Congress has the authority and the responsibility to act so as to preserve a healthful balance between the rights and functions of the State governments and the Federal Government. I sincerely urge this body to give early consideration to the enactment of legislation which will preserve this necessary balance.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will secure to the States the right to levy and collect any nondiscriminatory privilege tax with certain exceptions thereto

Whereas the United States Supreme Court in an opinion written in the case of *Kern-Limerick, Inc., v. Scurlock* (347 U. S. 110) has held that a contractor with a Federal agency can be constituted a Federal purchasing agent in the absence of a Federal act prohibiting this, and thereby the contractor's purchases and use of tangible personal property are immunized from State taxation; and

Whereas under the rule established by this opinion practically any activity engaged in by a private contractor on behalf of a Federal agency can be immunized from any State taxation by appropriate contract phraseology, resulting in serious interference with State and local powers of taxation contrary to the established policy of Congress and the expressed will of the executive branch of the Federal Government; and

Whereas no additional rights of taxation are sought on behalf of the States, only the restoration and preservation of these rights which existed prior to the pronouncement of the rule now complained of; and

Whereas if there is to be any withdrawal from the sovereign States of the Union or

any portion of their power to tax Government contractors, there should be an equal withdrawal from the Federal Government of its power to tax State employees and contractors, to the end that the power to tax shall remain in balance: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina (the Senate concurring),* That the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact, as speedily as possible, legislation which will secure and make certain to the States of the Union the power and right to levy and collect any nondiscriminatory privilege tax upon any privilege exercised under the protection and authority of the laws of any State in the Union, except such taxes which the direct incidence shall be upon the United States.

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present a concurrent resolution which was adopted by the State Legislature of Minnesota memorializing Congress to cause to be issued coins commemorating the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union. My colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], has submitted such a resolution, and this particular memorial from the State legislature encourages the adoption of that resolution. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution may be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, under the rule, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to cause to be issued coins commemorating the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union

Whereas by act of Congress Minnesota was admitted to the Union May 11, 1858; and

Whereas plans are being made for a statewide celebration of this centennial in the year 1958; and

Whereas Congress has many times previously authorized the issuance by the United States Treasury of commemorative coins for other States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved (by the senate, the house of representatives concurring),* That the Congress be requested to enact such legislation as may be necessary to authorize and direct the United States Treasury to issue 150,000 commemorative half dollar coins, of appropriate design, dated 1958; and be it further

*Resolved,* That said coins be delivered to the Minnesota Statehood Centennial Commission upon payment therefor and that said commission be, and it hereby is, authorized to sell and distribute such coins; be it further

*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to the Members of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

KARL ROLVAAG,  
President of the Senate.  
ALFRED D. JOHNSON,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Passed the senate the 14th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1955.

HY SERRING,  
Secretary of the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives the 10th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1955.

G. H. LEAHY,  
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.  
Approved April 23, 1955.

ORVILLE J. FREEMAN,  
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

#### MINIMUM WAGE AND HOUR LAW— RESOLUTION OF DICKINSON (N. DAK.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the Dickinson, N. Dak., Chamber of Commerce, opposing any change in the present minimum wage and hour law.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DICKINSON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,  
Dickinson, N. Dak., May 9, 1955.  
The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: At the regular April meeting of the board of directors of the Dickinson Chamber of Commerce, the following resolution was passed unanimously and is forwarded to you for your consideration:

"Whereas the Congress of the United States is, in bills S. 662, S. 770, and the Smith bill, and others, which would increase the minimum wage and extend the coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act, considering the problem of wage legislation; and

"Whereas it is the opinion and belief of the Board of Directors of the Dickinson Chamber of Commerce that the question of wages and hours is a private problem of the free competitive system, and that any extension of Government control is interfering with private business, and that the competitive enterprise system itself will control the question of minimum wages and laws: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* that the Members of Congress from North Dakota be requested to lend their support to congressional action to defeat any measure intended to change the present minimum wage and hour law, or extend coverage into classifications of business; further

*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate representing North Dakota, and to the governor of the State."

ROBERT A. STRANIK,  
President, Dickinson Chamber of  
Commerce.

Attest:

JOHN W. JOHNSON,  
Manager.

#### FUNDS FOR OPERATION OF CRIP- PLED CHILDREN'S PROGRAM— RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by Gilbert C. Grafton Post, No. 2, of the American Legion, Fargo, N. Dak., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide sufficient funds for the operation of the crippled children's program, for the fiscal year 1956.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the American Legion since its founding in 1919 has had as one of its four main objectives, care for the children of America; and

Whereas the Social Security Act, as amended, authorized the appropriation of \$15 million a year for the United States program for Crippled Children; and

Whereas the 1956 appropriations bill passed the House of Representatives March

21 with only \$10,800,000 included in it for the crippled children's program: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by Gilbert C. Grafton Post, No. 2, of the American Legion meeting at Fargo, N. Dak., May 3, 1955,* That we favor the full appropriation of the authorized \$15 million for the fiscal year 1956 in the operation of the crippled children's program and request Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, of North Dakota, a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, to support action to amend the House passed bill to that extent; and be it further

*Resolved,* That Post Adjutant Glen W. Rott be instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to Senators YOUNG and LANGER.

JOHN J. PREBASKE,  
Post Commander.  
GLEN W. ROTT,  
Post Adjutant.

#### ESTABLISHMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF A NATIONAL SEED STORAGE FACILITY—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Greater North Dakota Association—North Dakota State Chamber of Commerce, at Fargo, N. Dak., on April 27, 1955, favoring the enactment of legislation to establish and maintain a national seed storage facility.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### RESOLUTION ON NATIONAL SEED STORAGE FACILITY

Whereas a national seed storage facility is badly needed in this country to provide a germ plasm bank which will insure protection of the widely diversified sources of breeding material in our national and State programs for developing superior varieties of plants; and

Whereas agriculture, the backbone of North Dakota's economy, could be greatly aided by the establishment of such a national seed storage facility; and

Whereas a third of all the grains introduced from all over the world in the past 50 years have been destroyed because of the loss of germination due largely to improper storage facilities; and

Whereas due to this loss of breeding lines research work has been seriously handicapped in many cases: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the executive committee of the Greater North Dakota Association, North Dakota State Chamber of Commerce, in session at Fargo this 27th day of April 1955,* That all help possible be given to secure necessary Federal funds to establish and maintain a national seed storage facility suitable to provide proper storage for a germ plasm bank for our grain.

HOMER W. LUDWICK,  
Executive Secretary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 922. A bill to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to further extend the program to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals; with an amendment (Rept. No. 359).

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; with amendments:

S. 1464. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain rights-of-



way and timber access roads (Rept. No. 364); and

S. 1747. A bill to increase the public benefits from the national park system by facilitating the management of museum properties relating thereto, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 365).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 180. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washita River Basin reclamation project, Oklahoma; with amendments (Rept. No. 361); and

H. R. 103. A bill to provide for the construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects by irrigation districts and other public agencies; with an amendment (Rept. No. 362).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1755. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, and the act of August 31, 1954, so as to provide that the rate of interest on certain loans made under such acts shall not exceed 3 percent per annum; without amendment (Rept. No. 363).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1138. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended, providing certain construction and other authority; without amendment (Rept. No. 367).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 3885. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain Coast Guard contracts; without amendment (Rept. No. 366).

## ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, and I submit a report (No. 360), thereon.

The report relates to a joint resolution submitted by the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], and pertains to the so-called Lodge-Gossett bill passed by the Senate 3 or 4 years ago.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

## SUMMARY OF REPORT OF ARMED SERVICES SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Committee on Armed Services this morning approved a report of the Subcommittee on Civil Defense which had held hearings to study the problems of civil defense. I believe the report will be of interest to those who are concerned with administering civil defense, and also to the people of the Nation. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a short summary of the report.

There being no objection, the summary of the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### SUMMARY OF REPORT OF ARMED SERVICES SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL DEFENSE BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

This subcommittee, consisting of myself (chairman), Senators SYMINGTON, JACKSON, SALTONSTALL, and MARGARET CHASE SMITH, has held extensive hearings for the purpose of examining the policies and operations of the present civil defense program. The subcommittee issued its interim report in order to summarize its finding and recommendations at an appropriate interval during its examination.

In the report the subcommittee found that:

1. Due to lack of progress, the country is presently unprepared to deal with a successful H-bomb attack, with the result that millions of lives possibly could be lost due to the inability to evacuate the cities and care for evacuees.

2. The United States is becoming increasingly vulnerable to an H-bomb attack due to the Russian development of thermonuclear weapons and of heavy jet bombers which are aimed in the direction of the United States.

3. Despite the fact that evacuation of target areas is the only alternative in case of attack, there are presently no adequate evacuation plans for such areas. The report notes that if a 20-megaton weapon were dropped on a city containing a million people in a central area 10 miles across, about 900,000 would be killed if they remained in that area. If they could all move outward 15 miles, probably fewer than 10,000 would be casualties from a direct strike of the weapon.

4. No present plans exist for feeding the evacuated populations.

5. The Nation is medically unprepared to meet an attack. No adequate plans exist for mass medical care or for organizing the vast medical resources of the country.

6. The knowledge concerning radioactive fallout creates an added dimension to the civil-defense problem, requiring erection of protective shelters, research on fallout patterns, and the effect of radiation on all living things.

7. The roads and highways from our large cities are not adequate for civil-defense evacuation. The Federal Government should bear the principal burden for additional evacuation highways. The current road bill should be amended for this purpose.

8. The FCDA has an advisory committee of outstanding citizens who are acutely interested and well versed in problems of civil defense. The FCDA Administrator should call this committee into session for consultation more frequently.

9. The present weakness in the civil-defense program should not be aimed solely at the Federal Civil Defense Administration. The relatively insignificant place occupied by the Federal Civil Defense Administration in the Federal Government, together with its relatively small staff and its physical location, create basic difficulties which, unless resolved, could make unlikely any successful operation of the agency.

The subcommittee in its report recommended that:

1. The President assume the personal responsibility for providing the leadership which will develop an adequate civil-defense program—that he frankly tell the American people what would happen to our target areas in the event of a successful H-bomb attack, and then state in plain terms what the Federal Government intends to do to meet this possibility.

2. The Federal Government assume the responsibility for developing plans for evacuation, mass feeding, and for the medical care of people in case of an attack.

3. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has shown commendable initiative in carrying out the delegations given to this Department. Secretary Hobby, in addition to placing responsibilities with her capable Assistant Secretaries, has personally taken an active interest in the whole problem of civil defense. Secretary Hobby's activities, however, are handicapped because of the lack of policy decisions as to who is responsible for sheltering, feeding, and clothing evacuees from target areas. These problems are beyond the capacities of the States alone to meet. The report emphasized that these problems would also require at the same time full utilization of State and local resources.

4. The Federal Government utilize more extensively its authority to delegate civil-defense responsibilities to the various Federal agencies.

5. The question be resolved and clarified in the executive branch as to what responsibilities, if any, the military services should assume in the civil-defense program.

6. The Federal Civil Defense Administration should assume the responsibility for coordination of planning in target areas which overlap several State boundaries.

7. Highway program.

8. Civil-defense advisory committee.

9. Among the broad policy questions, the subcommittee noted the need for: (a) Clarifying the matter of proper division of fiscal responsibilities between the States and the Federal Government; (b) a policy on the sharing of resources in case of attack; and (c) reconsideration of a revised policy on dispersal. It was noted that the subcommittee intends to recommend the formation of a commission to study the dispersal matter.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S. 2009. A bill to remove the manufacturers' excise tax from the sales of certain component parts for use in other manufactured articles, and to confine to entertainment type equipment the tax on radio and television apparatus; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 2010. A bill for the relief of Jose dos Santos Soares; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 2011. A bill for the relief of Andonios Demetrios Dilbois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2012. A bill for the relief of Chong You How (also known as Edward Charles Yee), his wife, Eng Lai Fong, and his child, Chong Yim Keung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHOEPEL:

S. 2013. A bill to provide for an emergency wheat program to be effective in 1956 if producers disapprove marketing quotas for the 1956 wheat crop; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCHOEPEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

S. 2014. A bill to strengthen the law with respect to bribery and graft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2015. A bill to prohibit experiments upon living dogs in the District of Columbia and providing a penalty for violation thereof; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2016. A bill for the relief of Lawrence F. Kramer;

S. 2017. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit the misuse by collecting agencies of names, emblems, and insignia to indicate Federal agency; and

S. 2018. A bill for the relief of certain individuals whose land was flooded by action of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2019. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 2020. A bill for the relief of Carmen Aguado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 2021. A bill to provide that payments be made to certain members of the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians as reimbursement for damages suffered as the result of the establishment of the Pine Ridge aerial gunnery range, and to provide a rehabilitation program for the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 2022. A bill for the relief of Arnold Rosenthal; and

S. 2023. A bill for the relief of Panayiotis (John) Foradis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2024. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Natural Resources; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

## AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE RELATING TO REMOVAL OF CERTAIN MANUFACTURERS' EXCISE TAXES

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to remove the manufacturers' excise tax from the sales of certain component parts for use in other manufactured articles, and to confine to entertainment-type equipment the tax on radio and television apparatus. I ask unanimous consent that a statement accompanying the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2009) to remove the manufacturers' excise tax from the sales of

certain component parts for use in other manufactured articles, and to confine to entertainment-type equipment the tax on radio and television apparatus, introduced by Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania is as follows:

### STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY S. 2009

#### GENERAL STATEMENT

The bill will provide for certain minor technical amendments to the administrative provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the Federal manufacturers' excise taxes imposed by chapter 32.

Under existing law and administrative practice, repair and replacement parts for automobiles, household-type refrigerators, etc., may be sold tax-free for use by the vendee in the further manufacture of other articles, whether or not these other articles are subject to manufacturers' excise taxes. Section 1 of the bill codifies these provisions and makes them uniformly applicable to all repair and replacement parts, including parts for radio and television receivers and camera lenses.

Section 2 of the bill supplies a needed clarification of the original intent of Congress to confine the 10 percent manufacturers' excise tax on radio and television receiving sets to apparatus of the entertainment type. It would also remove the tax from chassis, speakers, amplifiers, power-supply units, antenna of the built-in type and phonograph mechanisms where the cost of compliance and enforcement is not warranted by the negligible revenues produced.

The enactment of the bill will—

1. Considerably ease excise administrative and compliance problems;
2. Avoid indirect taxation of articles which Congress has not deemed it desirable to subject to direct taxation;
3. Eliminate discrimination against manufacturers of repair and replacement parts where there are substitute parts not subject to tax; and,
4. Remove indirect tax now imposed upon States and municipalities and exports where taxable parts are bought for use by the vendee in the further manufacture of a non-taxable end article.

The enactment of the bill will result in a revenue loss of less than \$2 million, a very substantial portion of which will be recouped from major savings in cost of compliance and enforcement.

#### DETAILED EXPLANATION OF BILL

##### Section 1. Sales of certain taxable component parts for use in other manufactured articles

Section 1 of the bill is identical (except with respect to effective dates) to section 12 (b) of H. R. 6440, 83d Congress, as reported by the Senate Finance Committee in Senate Report No. 2038. The statement of the Senate Finance Committee with respect to this provision is as follows:

"This section, which was added by your committee, provides that parts, accessories or components subject to manufacturers' excise taxes may be sold free of tax (or a refund or credit provided to the vendee where not so sold) if the vendee uses, or resells, them as material in the manufacture or production of, or as a component part of other articles, whether or not the other articles are subject to a manufacturers' excise tax. Parts, accessories or components presently subject to manufacturers' excise tax are automotive parts or accessories, refrigeration components, radio or television components, and camera lenses. Presently most of these parts or components are taxable if sold to a manufacturer for incorporation in

an article not subject to a manufacturers' excise tax, or if sold for resale to such a manufacturer. This is true of radio and television components and camera lenses. Refrigerator components, however, are not taxable if sold for incorporation in, or as components of, refrigeration equipment whether or not such equipment is subject to manufacturers' excise tax. (This provision is eliminated by this bill as no longer necessary.) Under a ruling of the Internal Revenue Service issued in 1932, automotive parts and accessories (other than spark plugs, storage batteries, leaf springs, coils, timers, and tire chains), may be sold free of tax by one manufacturer to another manufacturer even though they are to be used in the manufacture of nontaxable articles. On the other hand, if such parts and accessories are sold taxpaid, no credit or refund may be claimed if they are used in the manufacture of nontaxable articles.

"The adoption of a single rule for these parts or components exempting them from tax where they are sold for incorporation in other end articles, whether or not the end articles are taxable, will result in a uniform application of these taxes and thereby provide greater equity and simplify administration and compliance. Providing for tax-free sales where the end products are not taxable also will prevent the indirect taxation of articles which Congress has not deemed it desirable to subject to direct excise taxation. Furthermore, where there are substitute components for these end articles which are not subject to tax, this removes the discrimination against the manufacturers of the taxable parts or components. Moreover, this will remove the indirect tax paid by States and municipalities, or with respect to articles produced for export, where these parts or components are purchased by manufacturers for incorporation in other articles. It is believed that the effect of this provision on revenues will be negligible."

##### Section 2. Radio and television receiving sets and component parts

Section 2 of the bill is identical (except with respect to effective dates) to section 8 (b) of H. R. 6440, 83d Congress. The statement of the Senate Finance Committee with respect to this provision is as follows:

"This section, which was added by your committee, provides that the 10 percent excise tax on radios, television sets, phonographs, automobile radio or television sets, and combination radio, television or phonograph sets, is to apply only if the article is of the entertainment type. It also limits to cabinets and tubes, the radio and television components which are to be taxable when sold separately from a set. Under the amendment the following items are exempt from tax: chassis, speakers, amplifiers, power supply units, antennas of the built-in type and phonograph mechanisms. The definition of radio and television components has also been changed so as to tax components for taxable sets, in lieu of components which are suitable for use on or in connection with, as component parts of taxable sets. The word for in this case is to be interpreted in the same manner as in the case of the excise tax on automobile parts and accessories, where it has been interpreted as taxing parts and accessories the primary use of which is in taxable motor vehicles. The above changes also make it possible to remove several provisions in present law relating to the special exemption for communication, detection and navigation receivers when sold to the United States Government, as these receivers will in any case be exempt under the new provisions since they are not of the entertainment type. This exemption, however, is preserved for any article with respect to which the tax is paid under section 3404 (a) or (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 as in effect



prior to the effective date of the amendments to such section. Therefore, any manufacturer, producer, or importer who has sold a receiver to the United States may still claim a credit or refund for the tax paid under section 3404 (a) or (b) for any article incorporated in such receiver.

"This excise tax has been limited to items of the entertainment type because your committee sees no reason for singling out special communication and navigation equipment used by businesses for special excise-tax levies. This is in conformance with similar actions taken by Congress in recent years in revising the tax bases of the excise taxes on photographic apparatus and film and electric, gas and oil appliances. Moreover, this change and the narrowing of taxable components to cabinets and tubes will considerably ease administrative and compliance problems under this tax. The revenue loss of the provisions in a full year of operation is estimated at \$2 million."

#### EMERGENCY WHEAT PROGRAM

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for an emergency wheat program to be effective in 1956 if producers disapprove marketing quotas for the 1956 wheat crop. Wheat producers will be asked to vote on the question of quotas on June 25.

Under the current law, producers have little choice in their vote. Simply stated, they choose between strict acreage controls at the minimum of 55 million acres with a price support of 80 to 82½ percent of parity or the same restricted acreage, 55 million, and a price support of 50 percent of parity. This is, in fact, no choice.

One of the most serious problems facing wheat producers, particularly in the quality wheat area, is that their acreages have been decreased to such an extent that they no longer have real economic units.

I believe the wheat producers, if given a choice of continuing under the minimum acreage—55 million—at a relatively high Government guaranteed price support, or a slightly relaxed acreage of 62 million for 1956, with a lower support, 70 percent Government guaranty, they will have a realistic choice to make.

The bill simply proposes that wheat producers be given a choice as described above in the referendum on June 25; and the program they choose will be in effect in 1956.

There is every indication that unless wheat farmers are given a realistic choice that the present market quota program may be disapproved. This means that the level of price support for wheat will be at only 50 percent of parity, roughly \$1.19 a bushel. Under the program that I am proposing, if the producers should choose the higher acreage and a less Government guaranty, wheat would be supported at an average of about \$1.66.

I believe that the Congress owes it to itself actually to find out through a referendum what producers think with regard to variable price supports. This will give Congress that opportunity.

I am hopeful that the Congress will act on this measure in time for it to be placed on the ballot. Failing to do this, I am sure that we must have this or some measure ready to put into effect should the farmers disapprove quotas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2013) to provide for an emergency wheat program to be effective in 1956 if producers disapprove marketing quotas for the 1956 wheat crop, introduced by Mr. SCHOEPPEL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### STRENGTHENING THE LAW WITH RESPECT TO BRIBERY AND GRAFT

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to strengthen the law with respect to bribery and graft. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2014) to strengthen the law with respect to bribery and graft, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. WILLIAMS is as follows:

##### STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAMS

The purpose of the bill is to strengthen the law with respect to bribery and graft.

In brief, it will discourage the questionable practice which has been constantly called to our attention by congressional committees whereby Government employees who held positions either in the procurement, lending, or revenue collecting agencies of the Government subsequently obtained rather lucrative positions with the same corporations they favored in negotiating contracts or loans.

This proposed legislation would not prevent the bona fide employment of a Government official by any company with whom he wished to become associated. It simply provides that when such employee accepts a position with a company with whom his agency did business during his period of Government service, the agency with whom he worked would be officially put on notice of his intentions to enter the employment of the company. With the Government properly on notice, the agency involved would have ample opportunity to discover those few cases wherein such employment could be questioned.

This proposed legislation was worked out with the cooperation of the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, the former Comptroller General of the United States.

In a letter to me under date of August 18, 1950, Mr. Warren says, and I quote:

"The broad subject of Government officers and employees going to work for Government contractors long has been of deep concern to the General Accounting Office. Certainly there can be no objection to any legitimate efforts of such people to obtain employment in private industry, or to efforts of private industry to secure the services of qualified employees. But it is equally certain that arrangements of this kind must be consistent with the public interest. I think you will agree that there is inherent in the public service and in dealings with the Government, the requirements for exceptionally high standards of conduct.

"The real danger lies in the illicit inducement of Federal personnel by Government

contractors, and solicitation by those personnel of an advantage from the contractor. As shown in my reports to the Congress and testimony before its committees, this may take the form of highly remunerative positions, or expensive entertainment, or other things of value, in return for special favors or privileges for the contractors. Often it originates or is implemented by veiled or outright connivance on the part of the Government people involved. Whether consummated or not, such dealings are inimical to the interests of the United States. They are nothing less than plain bribery."

The former Comptroller General then suggested certain amendments to strengthen those sections of the criminal statutes, Nos. 201 and 202, dealing with the bribery of Government officers and employees, and they are contained in the first part of my bill.

A new section is added at the end of chapter 11. It is designed to provide information which will form the basis for more effective action to implement the criminal statutes as well as the present safeguards for the expenditure of public funds.

The mere existence of these provisions on the statute books would have a powerful deterrent effect. The intent and the overt act to defeat the public interest or defraud the United States, by connivance between Government employees and contractors for future employment, would be punishable. Yet those whose arrangements are entirely legal and ethical would not be penalized. They would have ample protection to do what the honest businessman does in the everyday course of business. At the same time the Government, through information given to the agencies, would have effective means to check on the legality of the dealings with special reference to established safeguards for the expenditure of public funds.

This bill has been recommended by the Comptroller General as being necessary and I cannot urge too strongly, in view of the extensive Government procurement, that it be given favorable consideration.

#### AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Civil Service Commission has sent to the Vice President suggestions for changes in the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954—Public Law 598.

As chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in the 83d Congress, it was my privilege to sponsor the legislation. It has been well received by the Federal employees. Experience under the act has demonstrated that some changes would improve the act. I therefore introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2019) to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the third proviso of section 7 (d) of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. Section 7 (e) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The companies eligible to participate as reinsurers and the amount of insurance under the policy or policies to be allocated to each issuing company or reinsurer may be redetermined by the Commission for and in advance of any policy year after the first, on a basis consistent with subsections (c) and (d) of this section, with any modifications thereof it deems appropriate to carry out the intent of such subsections, and based on each participating company's group life insurance in force, excluding that under any policy or policies purchased under this act, in the United States on the most recent December 31 for which information is available to it, and shall be so redetermined in a similar manner not less often than every 3 years or at any time that any participating company withdraws from participation: *Provided*, That if, upon any such redetermination, in the case of any issuing company or reinsurer which insured employees of the Federal Government on December 31, 1953, under policies issued to an association of Federal employees, the amount which results from the application of the formula referred to in subsection (d) of this section is less than the total decrease, if any, since December 31, 1953, in the amount of each company's insurance under such policies, the amount allocated to such company shall be increased to the amount of such decrease."

SEC. 3. Section 10 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10 (a) The Commission is authorized to arrange with any nonprofit association of Federal employees for the assumption by the fund of any existing life insurance agreements of such association with, or for the benefit of, those of its members retired or otherwise separated from the Federal service who consent to the transfer and deposit required by subsections (c) and (d) of this section, and the Commission is further authorized to insure the obligations assumed with any company or companies meeting the requirements of section 7 (a).

"(b) Any such arrangement shall provide that premium payments by such insured members shall thereafter be made at the same rates to the fund, under such conditions as the Commission may prescribe.

"(c) Any such arrangement shall further provide that, upon the termination of the association's life insurance agreements under subsection (d) and the distribution of its assets, there be transferred to and deposited in the fund the shares of the total assets of the life insurance fund of such association that would otherwise actually be due to those retired or separated members who consent to have their shares so transferred: *Provided*, That the transfer of assets of any association hereunder shall be accomplished in accordance with the procedures and conditions prescribed by the Commission, and in accordance with the requirements of any applicable law of a State of the United States or of the District of Columbia.

"(d) The arrangements authorized by this section shall be made only with those associations which terminate all life insurance agreements with, or for the benefit of, their insured members within 6 calendar months following the date of enactment of this amending act, or such later date as the Commission may agree when there are extenuating circumstances, but not later than August 17, 1957, and such arrangements shall apply only to life insurance grants to any insured member before January 1, 1954.

"(e) The fund shall not assume liability for life insurance as provided in this section in respect to a person who is insured under other provisions of this act, and the liability for life insurance assumed by the fund as provided in this section shall terminate with respect to any person who becomes insured under other provisions of this act."

## JOINT COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to provide for the creation by the Congress of a Joint Committee on Natural Resources between the Senate and the House of Representatives, a bipartisan joint committee, to serve as a watchdog group to protect the public's interest in developing sound, coordinated national conservation policies, and safeguarding the execution of those policies.

Last year, I introduced a joint resolution calling for creation of such a joint committee. A similar joint resolution was introduced in the House of Representatives. While no action was taken last year, considerable interest has been evidenced in this proposal by sportsmen of America and conservationists generally. For that reason, I am again introducing the joint resolution this year, and urging active support for its adoption.

Every study pertaining to resource development has pointed to the need for greater policy coordination within the executive branch. New recommendations toward that objective are expected to be forthcoming soon from the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. I feel very strongly we in the Congress should put our own house in order and provide the proper mechanism for similar policy coordination within the legislative branch.

My views about the urgent need for some such action were outlined recently in an article entitled "Protecting America's Natural Resources," which appeared in the winter issue of *Heartland*, the United States-Canadian Quarterly of Inland America. Because it explains the proposal in detail, I ask unanimous consent for the article to be published at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 72) to establish a Joint Committee on Natural Resources, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The article presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

### PROTECTING AMERICA'S NATURAL RESOURCES (By Senator HUBERT M. HUMPHREY)

The American people are quite properly concerned over indications that we as a nation may be slipping backward from some of the great conservation policies established since the days of President Theodore Roosevelt.

Much of our Nation's strength and progress has been made possible by our abundance of great natural resources—land, water, timber, oil, and minerals—and the wisdom with which we have developed and used them.

We who are from the great heartland of America, so rich in the abundance of such resources, are particularly concerned with their wise use and preservation for generations yet unborn.

But we have long ago learned the dangers of exploiting and wasting these valuable resources.

We know they are not unlimited. We know that they must be carefully safeguarded from exhaustion.

We have seen what happened down through history to other civilizations, when they exploited their resources beyond replenishment.

We cannot let that happen in our country.

We have tried to make certain it will not happen, as a matter of public policy.

For years we have responded to the will of the people by establishing safeguards over the uses of these resources, and sought to protect them for future generations to share.

Yet, shortsighted pressures still exist for raids on these great national treasures. There are those who would be willing to exploit them for whatever immediate profit they could obtain, regardless of the consequences in the future.

We have seen those forces at work in virtually every field of natural resources; we have seen develop a growing demand for abrupt turnabout in public policy that would cause Gifford Pinchot to roll over in his grave.

Now, if never before, we need a strong revival of a crusading spirit for the protection of our vast forests; for protection and proper development of our water resources; for protection of our soil fertility on our farms; for the safeguarding of our petroleum resources.

We need firm national conservation policies, embracing all forms of natural resources, and putting foremost the public's stake in preservation of such resources for useful purposes in generations to come.

One of our great weaknesses in development of national conservation policies has been the multitude of agencies and groups concerned with different phases of the conservation problem.

We have conservation responsibilities and problems in the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Interior, the Department of Commerce, the Army engineers.

We have conservation policies being passed upon in various forms by the Senate Committees on Agriculture and Forestry, on Interior and Insular Affairs, and on Public Works.

Often we in the legislative branch of government have protested and objected to overlapping or duplicating authorities in the executive branch; we have also protested lack of effective coordination where divided responsibility exists.

There seem to be sound grounds for creation of a Joint Committee on Natural Resources between the Senate and the House of Representatives—a bipartisan joint committee.

Last year, I introduced a resolution in the Senate calling for creation of such a joint committee. A similar resolution was introduced in the House. While no action was taken last year, considerable interest has been evidenced in this proposal by sportsmen of America, and conservationists generally. For that reason, I am again introducing the resolution in Congress this year, and urging active support for its adoption.

It would be a watchdog committee to help develop sound, coordinated national conservation policies, and safeguard the execution of those policies.

It is not the purpose of the resolution to interfere with or curtail existing functions of any congressional committees with reference to conservation of national resources; rather, it would create supplemental functions that should be helpful to all of the existing committees.

The purpose of the joint committee would be to investigate the operations and effects of all Federal statutes dealing with natural resources, to investigate the administration of such statutes by the executive depart-



ments, boards, bureaus, agencies, independent establishments and instrumentalities of the Government charged with their administration, and to make such other investigations with respect to conservation of natural resources as the joint committee should deem necessary.

The committee would be required to make reports to the Senate and House from time to time concerning the results of its investigations, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

The resolution calls for a Joint Committee on Natural Resources consisting of 16 members, 8 from each of the 2 Houses of Congress, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, with not more than 8 of the members being from any one political party.

In the meantime, there is much that the executive branch of our Government can and should do toward developing a more forward-looking resource development program before the Congress.

Circumstances of world or domestic conditions may be the controlling factor in deciding when some of the greatly needed improvements can be carried out. But the advance planning for what must eventually be done can and should be started now.

During the sharp dip in employment last summer and fall, much talk was heard about having a shelf of available public-works projects to create employment and maintain purchasing power.

Many of us hope our great natural resources are not overlooked in the development of any such backlog or shelf of potentially desirable projects. All of us know of the great and lasting contributions made to our country by the Civilian Conservation Corps in years gone by, both in physical improvements to our parks and forests and in the rehabilitation of young men who might have become wandering derelicts and delinquents had it not been for useful, healthful, outdoor employment.

We need to be thinking about a similar program for the future—having it ready to go into action immediately if ever again we suffer a sharp slump in our domestic economy that deprives young people of jobs and hope and a future.

We need imaginative thinking—looking into the future.

The demand on these resources is going to be greater and greater as our population soars. We need soon to take stock and prepare for the future.

Nearly a year ago I called on the United States Forest Service, the United States Soil Conservation Service, the National Park Service, and the Fish and Wildlife Service to start thinking about future public-works projects that would make productive contributions to our country's future, as well as provide temporary employment in rural as well as urban areas. I hope it stimulated some constructive thinking. From the letters I have received from these important agencies charged with the responsibility of protecting our resources, they are eager to undertake such efforts—if only there is a public awakening to the need.

Let me quote from a portion of my reply from the United States Forest Service:

"Your suggestion for development of a backlog of public-works projects in forestry is an excellent one. . . ."

"We are very much in accord with your views that such a program can make substantial contributions in forest and related resource developments, as well as providing rural and urban employment in productive work. This fact is too little recognized by many of the advocates of public-work programs who have considered them as exclusively construction of large dams, buildings, highways, and projects of that type. Forest and forest-range land treatment have often been omitted from public-works programs—despite the importance that proper forest

land treatment and protection can have on minimizing construction needs for downstream flood-control structures."

What are we waiting for, America? Sooner or later we are going to need a more comprehensive program of protecting and improving our great national treasures—the timber, range, recreation, water, and wildlife resources of our land.

The idea of a watchdog committee in the Congress on natural resources is a step in that direction.

It is a call to protect the public's interests that should not be ignored.

It is an opportunity to aid, not raid, our natural resources.

I hope conservationists of our country will rally to its support.

#### ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:  
Address entitled "Winning the Cold War," delivered by Senator JOHNSON of Texas at a dinner honoring Gen. David Sarnoff, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, in New York City, on May 15, 1955.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:  
Statement made by him on his own behalf and for Senators HUMPHREY, KEFAUVER, and WILEY, introducing leaders of the Mayors' Committee to members of the press on May 18.

#### NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 1256, TO PROVIDE FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES, AND OTHER RELATED BILLS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled to commence on Thursday, May 26, 1955, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 1256, to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and other related bills. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the proposed legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman; the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]; the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]; the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]; and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

#### NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 972 BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON BANKING OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Banking of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that a public hearing will be held on S. 972 relating to the regulation of branches of Federal savings and loan associations. This hearing will begin at 10 a. m., Tuesday, May 31, 1955, in room 301, Senate Office Building.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at the hearing are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief clerk,

Committee on Banking and Currency, room 303, Senate Office Building, telephone National 8-3120, extension 865, before the close of business on Thursday, May 26, 1955.

#### THE CREDO OF THE LATE SENATOR CLYDE R. HOEY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, May 12, 1955, marked the first anniversary of the passing of my beloved predecessor, Senator Clyde Roark Hoey, who rightly merited and enjoyed to an unsurpassed degree the affection, the admiration, and the confidence of the people of North Carolina. Senator Hoey met with complete courage the trying problems which confronted him as citizen, churchman, advocate, State legislator, Representative in Congress, governor and Senator. He was able to do this because of his personal credo, which he entitled, "This I Believe." Senator Hoey's credo contains inspiration for all who will read it. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the credo was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I believe in faith. I have always had faith. As an adolescent I pondered the full-orbed canopy of the far-extended skyline and believed that there was a great first cause—God. To me there was no other explanation of the universe and no other assurance of protection and guidance. When 12 years of age I was privileged to work in a printing office for long hours daily and many times far into the night. After concluding the labors of the day and night, I would walk along a dark and lonely road, through woods and uninhabited sections for a long mile to my home. Scared of the dark, yes; afraid, to be sure; but armed with a heavy hickory walking stick, I looked up into a starlit sky and thought of my free heritage and believed in a Father God and would not admit my fears to even my collaborators. From the standpoint of the world I was unafraid. I am still unafraid.

Growing into manhood, with manifold responsibilities and perplexing problems, requiring all the resources of which I was capable, there was the constant and increasing need for some reservoir of power that could be tapped in periods of emergencies and hours of crises. In my faith I discovered that reservoir.

I found matrimony a happy estate. Blessed with a radiant and lovely life companion, the establishment and maintenance of a home was a high adventure, and the coming of children into that home brought the full realization of the joy and happiness possible only in this most honored and ancient of earth's institutions. Ten years ago, after 42 years of happy married life, my wife and the mother of my children passed to her reward. My faith in her and her faith in God linger as a blessed heritage in the sanctuary of holy memories. Faith has been indispensable amid the sorrows and sadnesses of life, and has been exhilarating and sustaining in periods of joy and triumph. The experience gained through the years, and whatever learning or knowledge I have acquired, have not lessened, but rather increased, my faith in a God who guides the destiny of nations and individuals and who even marks the falling of a sparrow.

Conscious of my own shortcomings and sins, ashamed of my failures and omissions of duty, and fully mindful of the unfaithfulness which has marked my life, I have never doubted the wisdom and goodness,

the might and the mercy of a gracious, loving Heavenly Father—God.

I join the late great Kansas editor, William Allen White, when he said in a period of crisis, "I am not afraid of tomorrow. I have seen yesterday. I love today, and I face tomorrow unafraid." There are many clouds on the horizon of America. I have had and shall have many dark nights, but there has never yet been a night dark enough to put out the stars—and there shall not be. This is still "my Father's world." And my faith abides.

#### STEPS TAKEN TO COMBAT PUBLICATION OF COMMUNIST LITERATURE IN JAPAN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently it has been my privilege to have had some contact and communication with the Director of the United States Information Agency, Mr. Theodore C. Streibert, as well as with his very able and competent deputy, Mr. Abbott Washburn. I have written to the United States Information Agency and the respective officials of that organization concerning certain developments in the field of information; and I have received, in reply, a letter dated April 4, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY,  
Washington, April 4, 1955.  
The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,  
United States Senate.

DEAR HUBERT: This is a preliminary acknowledgment of your good letter to Ted Streibert of March 29 about the overseas information program. Ted is currently out of the city.

With regard to the Communists' cheap-book program in Japan, we are attempting as best we can to meet this with activities about which Dr. Franklin Burdette, Chief of our Information Center Service, will shortly write you. It presents a difficult, complex problem of which money is only a part.

The Neue Zeitung, in West Berlin, was closed not for financial reasons but because German-owned West Berlin newspapers are now fully able to bring complete news from the free world viewpoint to their readers. In the opinion of Ambassador Conant and ourselves, there was no longer any necessity or desirability of a United States Government-owned newspaper in Berlin. Our Berlin Radio Station RIAS, however, continues in full operation as it is the primary source of truthful news for the people of East Berlin and East Germany.

Short-wave voice programs to Finland did not appear to be fully effective at the time they were discontinued—months ago. Accordingly they were sacrificed in the overall 37 percent congressional slash in budget for this work. (Final Truman year: \$122.5 million; fiscal 1954: \$76 million (net); fiscal 1955: \$77.1 million.)

We have requested increases for the work in Burma and India for fiscal 1956, and will know our chances when the House subcommittee markup becomes public on April 13. Are the reports you mention receiving from these countries something you would care to pass along to us? If so, I would like to have them studied by our assistant directors for these areas.

General Gruenther is, of course, right about the enormous jamming capability of the Soviet. Our signals do, however, get through and the evidence shows they are eagerly listened to. The Soviet bloc is currently beaming to foreign peoples some 1,675 hours of broadcasting weekly (Soviet Union,

623 hours; satellites, 812 hours; Red China, 88 hours; clandestine and other sources 152 hours). The Voice transmits some 894 hours weekly (as of March 1, 1955). And we, of course, do no jamming. For us to try to match the Soviet operation, program for program and transmitter for transmitter, would involve tremendous additional appropriations. I am not sure that such a course would be as productive as other avenues of information work.

We are asking Congress for an increase of \$1.5 million for radio in fiscal '56. Our total requested increase for USIA amounts to roughly \$12 million, which is just about what we asked last year—of which we finally got a little over \$1 million. Sincerely hope we do better this year.

With great appreciation for your continued active interest and help.

Sincerely,

ABBOTT WASHBURN,  
Deputy Director.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I called to the attention of Mr. Streibert a very serious problem developing in Japan, where the Red Chinese Government has been literally flooding the Japanese market with cheap literature, the price being so cheap as to make such publications readily available to any of the persons in Japan who would wish to purchase such books.

I called this matter to the attention of the United States Information Agency. I am pleased to note that in a letter dated April 12, Mr. Franklin L. Burdette, Chief of the Information Center Service, informed me, in reply, that the United States Government, in cooperation with certain private institutions, is taking very effective steps to combat this flood of cheap literature—and I mean "cheap" as to both text and price—which is coming upon the Japanese market.

I think the Senate will be interested to know that about 90 Japanese publishers issue translations of American books, as compared to about 1 dozen Japanese publishers who now issue Communist or pro-Communist books.

Mr. President, I commend this matter to the attention of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as well as to the attention of all Members of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters to which I have referred be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 29, 1955.

THEODORE C. STREIBERT,  
Director, United States Information Agency, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STREIBERT: It seems that I have been burdening you a great deal of late with requests for information and suggestions that have been sent along from constituents. I hope you will permit me to continue to do this, because I do so in the spirit of being helpful and not critical. Again let me assure you that I have a high regard for the United States Information Agency and the work that it is doing. I only regret that it is not permitted to do more due to what I believe to be inadequate appropriations.

Just the other day I received a letter from a friend of mine in Japan. This friend has been in Japan for several years and has a fairly good understanding of what goes on. My informant stated as follows:

"There is one thing that you ought to do something about. We understand that tons

of cheap literature is brought into Japan from Red China and/or Russia. The price is only 20 or 50 yen so that anyone can afford to read it. Japan is a nation that reads. You can be sure that nothing favorable about America will be found in these books. Why cannot similar material to promote good will for America be placed in Japanese bookshops? True, there are probably hundreds of free pamphlets. That is just the point. How can a bookshop dealer make any profit on free books? The books or pamphlets should be priced cheap enough for the consumer and high enough to give the bookshop owner a small profit."

Just what is the situation concerning American books and periodicals in Japanese bookshops? I am becoming ever increasingly concerned about the insufficiency and inadequacies of our information services. The closing down of the American-sponsored newspaper in Berlin last month, then our Voice of America program in Finland, along with reports that I continue to receive from Burma and India alarm me. What are we going to do about these developments? Surely this rich country can afford to tell its story to the world. General Gruenther testifying in executive session before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee told us only last Saturday that the Soviet Union was spending hundreds of millions of dollars every year just to jam or block reception of Voice of America broadcasts in the Soviet. I believe the record will reveal that he stated the Soviet spends more money to jam our broadcasts than we spend on our entire Voice of America program. Surely our America can match the Soviet, or are we about to confess that the dictatorship of the proletariat has more capital and finance than the Republic of the United States.

Sincerely yours,  
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY,  
Washington, April 12, 1955.  
The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Streibert has requested that I write to you about the activities we are conducting to meet the Communists' cheap book program in Japan, which you mentioned in your letter of March 29 addressed to him.

According to information supplied by the National Diet Library in Tokyo, there are now published in Japan more books translated from American than from Soviet Russian sources. In 1952 the opposite situation prevailed. The two major factors responsible for this reversal appear to be the extended activities of commercial agents, particularly Charles E. Tuttle & Co., representing United States publishers, and the expanded activity of USIS Tokyo. USIS activity is focused chiefly upon increasing the general knowledge of American books among Japanese publishers and intellectuals—through the issuance of a monthly Japanese-language book review, Beisho Dayori—and upon encouraging the publication of important American books by Japanese publishers with various means of USIS assistance. As a result, our competitive standing with Japanese book publishers is better than that of the Russians.

About 90 Japanese publishers issue translations of American books compared to about a dozen who put out Communist or pro-Communist books.

The Japanese book situation is more serious, however, when our books are compared with those coming from Communist China. Since 1953 cheap translations of books from Peking and Shanghai have become noticeably more plentiful. In order to meet this situation, we added last month to the staff of USIS Tokyo an officer who will be mainly concerned with developing large Japanese editions of American books which will sell



at the equivalent of 10 cents. The distribution of these books, beyond the usual bookstore outlets, and in our lack of a disciplined volunteer organized sales force similar to that of the Communists, will also require the attention of this officer. We aim to get these books particularly into the hands of Japanese students.

I should also like to mention the influence of the libraries in the cultural centers which we support in Japan. More than 300,000 American books are contained in these libraries and they are constantly used and highly regarded by Japanese students and intellectuals.

I deeply appreciate your interest in the overseas book program.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN L. BURDETTE,  
Chief, Information Center Service.

#### REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE ON HIS RECENT TRIP TO EUROPE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as all of us know, on last Tuesday night, at 7 p. m., the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, made his report to the President and to the American people, by means of television, on his recent trip to Europe. His report is of such importance that I believe it should be read by all of us. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the report and colloquy on that occasion with the President be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report and colloquy were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The PRESIDENT. Foster, it is good to have you here to tell us something of the significant events that took place during your recent visit to Europe. You realize that through the cameras in this room your report will go to the entire Nation. And so I hope that in addition to the details of that trip, you will tell us something about the developing scene in the international field as you see it, and something of the prospects for real progress in our incessant search for peace.

Mr. DULLES. Well, Mr. President, I am delighted to have a chance to report to you and to my Cabinet associates, and as you say, the American people, on what took place, particularly during this last week, a week so crowded with events that I hardly know how to start. But you might—

The PRESIDENT. Well, I will tell you, Foster, I think that it might be well to go clear back to 2 years ago. Then you will remember with our colleagues in the legislative branch on both parties the administration was developing the policies intended to produce, and basic to that policy was the belief—the conviction—that only through cooperative strength developed in the free world could we really face up to this threat that the Communist dictatorship posed to all free men. We believed, as you know, that until Western Europe had been united, until there were some German forces joining the NATO organization, and until we had some confidence in the Russian word through deeds rather than mere protestation, that it would do little good to have talks with them. And you will realize that you and I finally decided that I should make some pronouncement along this line, and did so, on April 16 of 1953.

Now we agreed at that time that if we could, through the kind of steps I have just mentioned, arrive at the point where we had a real basis for going ahead, even if only with faint hope of real progress, that we might finally develop between ourselves and

with the Soviets a new relationship that would at least allow some hope of progress toward this great goal of peace that is of course the great dream of every American.

So, against that kind of backdrop, I think you could relate the events of recent times and on your—just your recent trip to Europe, to tell us about the story as you see it.

Mr. DULLES. Well, Mr. President, I certainly remember that speech that you refer to. It has been a kind of bible for us in the State Department in the 2 years and some months that have elapsed since then.

What happened last week is to a very large extent a coming true of the things that we hoped for and planned at that time. And indeed I think now one can say that what happened may really mark a turning in the tide of history.

The first thing—the thing that you talked about at that time as of utmost importance—was this consolidation of Western Europe and the bringing into NATO of the Federal Republic of Germany as a free and independent, sovereign state. Well, you recall, and probably some of the television audience will recall, because I reported on it at the Cabinet meeting, you remember last October, we signed up at that time the treaties that were to bring this to pass.

But as we have learned through hard experience, there is quite a lot of difference, sometimes, between signing treaties and having treaties ratified and come into force. And in this case there was a terrific battle to bring about, of course, the coming into being of those treaties. And it was a hard battle because the Soviet Union went all-out with everything it had to prevent those ratifications, and there had to be ratifications in 15 countries. Many of them had to act through 2 legislative bodies. And if any one had slipped up, the whole scheme would have collapsed.

And the Soviet Union threatened, and it promised, and it used the Communist Party machinery in these different countries to threaten anybody who voted for these things that they would never be reelected again. That was a pretty tough battle, which was won by the forces of freedom and it involved the greatest diplomatic defeat that the Soviet Union has suffered, I would say, certainly since the war.

And the treaties came into force 12 days ago, exactly. Instruments of ratification were deposited. A week ago Monday we met together in Paris to mark the actual coming into being of what had then been planned—the meeting of the Western European Union, and the meeting of NATO into which Germany walked—in the presence of their great Chancellor Adenauer, whom you know so well and we all admire so much. It was a very significant and historic occasion. We all had little speeches prepared which we made when Adenauer came in, and then when we had finished, Adenauer himself spoke with great dignity and statesmanship. And when he had finished, the NATO Ministerial Council—I think for the first time in history—burst into applause. It is a pretty stuffy and formalistic body, and it was not as I say, I think the first time it ever happened.

But there was a sense of a great event as the free German Republic took its place there. And when you say—because, you see, F and G come together in the alphabet—France and Germany sat side by side, and you saw these two countries sitting there side by side as allies, you felt that a new page had been opened on European history, and that the vision which so many people have had for so many years of a United Europe had actually started to come to pass.

This Western civilization, you know, almost committed suicide with its incessant wars of the last hundred years and more. And it bled itself in man and treasure. But I think now the thing has been put together in such a way that Western civilization took

a new lease on life and is going to add strength and vigor for itself and for the benefit of all humanity.

That was the thing we saw happening in Europe. As you said, this unity of purpose and action we had to have. Now I think that is an accomplished fact.

Now I was in Europe and we dealt mostly with European problems, but I never forget the fact that we have got Asian problems as well as European problems, and I took advantage of this NATO Council to talk a bit to them about our Asian problems, because there is a considerable failure to understand the motivation of our Asian policies. And I said to these Ministers there, I said to them, if you like the United States as you see it manifested in Europe, you should understand what we are doing in Asia, because we are doing precisely the same thing in Asia that we want to do here. What are we doing? We are defending freedom where there are freemen who want to defend their own freedom. We believe in collective security to help them do that. We believe in being loyal to our friends and allies. And I said you seem to like those policies when you find them in Europe, and you ought also to recognize that those are the same policies motivating us in Asia, because I said, we don't have a double personality, we are just one nation, and the reason we are acting this way in Europe is because we really believe in these things, and if we believe in them we are going to act the same way in Asia.

The PRESIDENT. That is a wonderful way to tell them.

Mr. DULLES. I think they began to understand, perhaps, for the first time, what was back of our Asian policies. And then I took the opportunity to talk a good deal with the French Prime Minister, Edgar Faure, and the Foreign Minister, Monsieur Pinay, about the situation in Indochina. And the British Foreign Minister, Harold Macmillan, sat in on some of our talks. It was hard to get them in. Our days were busy. We mostly met at night. We had 3 or 4 meetings at night that lasted until 1 o'clock or more in the morning.

The main point I made there was that we had to accept the fact that Vietnam is now a free nation—at least the southern half of it is—and it has not got a puppet government, it has not got a government that we can give orders to, and tell what we want it to do, or we want it to refrain from doing. If it was that kind of government, we wouldn't be justified in supporting it—

The PRESIDENT. That's right.

Mr. DULLES. Because that kind of government is not going to last there. One can only hold free Vietnam with a government that is nationalistic and has a purpose of its own and responsive to the will of its own people, and doesn't take orders from anybody outside, whether it be from Paris—or Cannes for that matter—or from Washington. And that we have got to coordinate our policies to the acceptance of the fact that it is really a free and independent country.

We talked that over in its various implications and ramifications, hour after hour, during almost every day for the 4 days I was in Paris. And I think we came to a better understanding and that there is more chance of coordination of French policies with ours along sound lines than has been the case heretofore. The government of Diem which seemed to be almost on the ropes a few weeks ago, I think is reestablished with strength. It has been through a hard experience and I think it is going to have more support, within and without, than it has had before. And I look to that situation with more hope than we have had before. That is a byproduct of this trip which was designed primarily for European matters. We did, I think, make a considerable accomplishment in relation both to our China policy and in relation to Vietnam.

Well, then, came on to what was in a sense the highspot of the trip, I suppose, which was the signing of the Austrian treaty. Well, that is something that the United States has been working for for a long, long time. I myself first started to work on it in Moscow in 1947, where I went as adviser to George Marshall who was the Secretary of State. And they tell me—Mr. Hoover gave me the figures just a minute or two ago, he dug up in the State Department—that during these 8 years, we have had no less than 379, I think it was, Herbert, 379 meetings at one level or another with the Soviet representatives about this Austrian treaty. And oftentimes we would be just so close to getting it through that we would think it was just around the corner; but the corner seemed to be an interminable series of corners.

The PRESIDENT. It proves in this business you must not be easily discouraged.

Mr. DULLES. Well, we just kept sticking to it—

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DULLES. And all of a sudden—well, the heart of the difficulty was that the Soviet Union just couldn't bring themselves to take their Red Army troops out of their zone of Austria; and last year at the Berlin meeting we had agreed on all the terms of the treaty substantially except that at the last minute the Soviets said, "well, we will sign the treaty but with the understanding we can keep our troops on in there indefinitely." Well, of course, that would have been no effective treaty at all. So we turned it down, and we just kept on.

And the Austrian people, incidentally, kept their nerve in a wonderful way in this affair, and they never caved at all. For they knew their independence would not be worth anything if the Red Army was still around.

And all of a sudden, a few weeks ago, out of the blue, came this announcement that the Russians were willing to take their troops out of Austria. I don't think anybody yet knows fully just the significance—the full significance of that. It is just one of these breaks that come, if you keep on steadily, steadily, keeping the pressure on. And all of a sudden you get a break—and this break came. And it seemed to make possible, after all these long years of work, the consummation of this Austrian state treaty.

Now there were several features of the treaty that were still unsettled and where we wanted to get some improvements. And we got the Ambassadors at work in Vienna, while I was in Paris, working on the final details of the treaties, and there were some features, particularly about the economic clauses, which we were very anxious to get changed, and the Russians were very sticky about them.

Well, I said I would not go to Vienna until this thing was all closed up in a way I thought was reasonably satisfactory to the United States. So I planned—you gave me your plane, and it was delightful—that part of it was pretty nice—but I was going to take it on Thursday to go to Vienna, and I just wouldn't go. So we just postponed our plans. And I said I wasn't going to go to Vienna until the Ambassadors had agreed on this treaty in its final form because I felt once I got there in Vienna I would be hooked. So I just put it off. And then on Friday everything was closed up and I got the word that they had agreed. So on Friday I flew down to Vienna. And on Saturday we had a 5-power meeting; that is, the 4 occupying powers and the Austrians, at which we perfected the arrangement of protocol and the like for the carrying out of the treaty signature on Sunday.

And then we had the actual signature of the treaty on Sunday, about 11:30 o'clock I think it was. And that was a real occasion which those who saw it I think will never forget: The tremendous joy of the Austrian

people who had waited—because really their occupation goes back to the Hitler time—

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DULLES. In 1938, 17 years, been waiting for liberation. And the thing that particularly struck me as I went through the streets was the joy on the part of the older people, particularly the older people who had known the liberties of the past—

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DULLES. And had lived through these 17 years of occupation, now at last saw their liberation apparently at hand. And the older people just jumping up and down with joy—wrinkled faces—it just made your heart feel warm at the thought that we had been able to make some contribution to this spirit of joy which animated the whole Austrian people, particularly those that were in the Soviet zone of occupation.

Now a lot of people are trying to find mysterious reasons why the Soviets changed their policy, and that is something that, of course, deserves the very careful thought that we are giving it. As you know, Mr. President, we are studying all this very, very carefully, to discover the implications of it. But there are certainly implications of it that we can be quite sure of, as far as we ourselves are concerned, and which I think we can take great satisfaction from. In the first place, it marks the first time that the Red armies will have turned their face in the other direction and gone back, since 1945, when you were over there effecting the liberation of Europe from our side, and they had moved in from the other side, as you know.

This is the first time a segment of the Red army will have turned around and started to go back. Now that is bound to have a tremendous impact in the other countries where the Red armies are in occupation. It is going to create a desire—a mounting desire—on the part of those people to get the same freedom from that type of occupation that the Austrians have got. And furthermore, this joy at their freedom which was so manifest by the Austrian people, that is going to be contagious and it is going to spread, surely, through the neighboring countries, such as Czechoslovakia. For the first time there will be an open door to freedom on the part of Hungary. These things are bound to have an effect. And the Soviet Union, of course, they know they are going to have an effect. They thought about these things long ago. When they drew their zone of occupation in Austria, you remember, they drew it in a queer line, so as to be sure that they would block the borders to Czechoslovakia and to Hungary.

The PRESIDENT. That's right—that's right.

Mr. DULLES. Now they are giving that up. They know that there are going to be implications there, and that the peoples of these satellite countries are going to want to be getting for themselves the thing that they see the Austrians get. They want to dance in the streets with joy, too, sometime.

The Soviets are accepting those consequences. Why they are doing it, we are not quite sure. Except that we can be quite certain that the policies of strength and firmness that we are adopting, in partnership with the other free countries of Europe, are beginning to pay off. And the people of Austria are the first to say—and all of them did say to me—this is the first dividend from the creation of Western European unity and the bringing of Germany into NATO.

At the time when that was under debate, the Soviet Union was threatening terrible things would happen if we went through with this. But we and the other free countries of Europe did go through with it. And we find that the pay-off is not a terrible disaster, but for the first time an apparent softening of the Soviet policy, a willingness to give greater freedom and liberty to the captive satellite peoples. So I think we can say that those policies are actually beginning

to pay off—the policy of strength and firmness, and the standard of moral principle.

I said to a group I was talking to in Vienna Sunday, I said it is not worth much to speculate, really, as to who is winning, whether the Soviet Union is winning or the United States is winning, I said the important thing is that sound principles have won. And in the long run these high moral principles—

The PRESIDENT. That's right.

Mr. DULLES. Are going to be what are going to prevail. If we are behind them then we will automatically get the benefit of prevailing. But that is the important thing to bear in mind, that we had been standing, I think, for good, sound moral principle—with firmness, determination, with strength in the right; and if you do that long enough without weakening, the thing is going to come your way. And I think from that standpoint that time is working for us—as long as we work on these great moral principles.

Now I am going to turn to the thing that I know most people are most interested in, and I guess you have a special interest in, and that is—

The PRESIDENT. The four-power talks.

Mr. DULLES. The four-power talks, because this time, if they come off, you will be in them yourself. Now you said, Mr. President, in recalling what had happened, what you said in your speech of April 1953, that it has always been your resolution not to get yourself into any talks of that sort until and unless certain things had happened, things that made in a sense untouchable—irreversible—the solidity of the West, the freedom of Western Germany as a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Council, and some deeds by the Soviet Union in replacement of just these vague words that they had been talking.

Well, these things have happened, so you felt—as indeed did our allies and a great volume of world opinion feel—that the time had come, perhaps, for a further testing of the Soviet Union through a meeting at the level of the heads of government.

Now, nobody knows better than you that such a meeting has dangers as well as—

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DULLES. Opportunities. And the biggest danger of all is the danger that hopes will be raised so high that they can't possibly be realized. And then, either of two things will happen, either there will be an open disillusionment and a feeling of dismay on the part of the people, and a feeling that after all nothing can be done, and that the only alternative is war, because the last good chance will have been tried and failed; or, then, there is the possibility that in an effort to avoid that danger the heads of government meeting might arrive at a sort of an appearance of agreement, under ambiguous words where there was no real agreement. And I also—

The PRESIDENT. Foster, I don't believe that danger is quite so great as it was once, because my mail shows this: That the American people are really pretty well aware of what is going on. They realize this is merely a beginning and not an end. I have taken tremendous hope—

Mr. DULLES. Yes.

The PRESIDENT. And confidence from the tenor of the remarks I have seen in our newspapers, and commentators, and everybody else—I am sure that there is greater maturity than we would have expected several years ago.

Mr. DULLES. I do think the American people have become pretty sophisticated on this matter—

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DULLES. And they are not easily going to be fooled. I don't think they are going to get their—

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DULLES. Expectations too high. There is, perhaps, rather more danger in some of



the other countries than there is in the United States.

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DULLES. But you and I worked out the form of invitation to this meeting, in agreement with our allies, in a way which I think makes it crystal clear that that danger will not be incurred. Because, as you recall, the definition of the purpose is that we are to meet to try to find new paths, a new approach, new procedures, for solving some of these problems—

The PRESIDENT. That's right.

Mr. DULLES. And you will not attempt yourself to solve them. Now the heads of Government, great as they are, are not going to be able to get together for 3 or 4 days, and find a substantial solution for some of these problems that have defied solution for so many years, or even for so many generations.

The PRESIDENT. They couldn't even build Rome in 1 day.

Mr. DULLES. But therefore I think it is quite important to keep it clear, as the invitation did, that it is just for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DULLES. Now we weren't at all sure that the Soviet would accept that limited meeting. But I had a dinner in Vienna Saturday night, which was attended by the British and French Foreign Ministers and also by Mr. Molotov who is the Soviet Foreign Minister. And we sat around after dinner for several hours talking about this whole business, the philosophy of the approach, the limited scope that the meeting would have, and so far as I could judge, the Soviet Union accepted it, at least they said they did, and that would be on the record. Other details we have not worked out yet. But on the whole, it looks as though the kind of meeting that you are willing to have will also be the kind of meeting that they will be willing to have. And I think that will be a meeting which can be held safely, without running these great risks, and which may open up new opportunity.

Now, everybody wonders why the Soviets may be willing to change their practices. And I have thought about it quite a lot. Nobody can be sure. But I thought of this, Mr. President, that in every one of our well-ordered communities there are a lot of people who don't believe in their hearts in the rules and the laws that are there, but they find it more convenient to conform and not always to be bucking these things. Therefore, in any well-ordered community there are a lot of people who live up to the rules and the ordinances, and so on, even though they don't, perhaps, believe in them for themselves.

And it may possibly be the case that the Soviet Union, after this experience of trying to buck everything, may be feeling that it may be more convenient for them to conform to some of the rules and practices of a civilized community.

I don't think for a minute that they have got religion, or have been converted, but it just may be, as a practical matter, they may think they can get along better by conforming to some of these rules and practices which normally govern—

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DULLES. A civilized community. And I think that is a possibility which is at least worth exploring and that this meeting will give a further chance to explore it. And it may at least set up new processes for a solution of some of these great problems—problems like the unification of Germany, the problem of levels of armament, the problem of atomic weapons, the problem of the satellite countries, the problems created by international communism, which is such a pest around the world. If we can begin to think about how those problems can be solved, by a new spirit and a new purpose to their solution, then I think that something of good

can come out of this meeting. And I just do feel that we can face the future with new confidence, because these policies that we have adhered to, which have involved sacrifice, been supported by the American people on a bipartisan basis, they are beginning to pay off. And I think if we stick to those policies we are going to be all right.

The danger is that we relax and think that these policies have served their purpose, therefore let's switch to something different.

The proper thing is, these policies work, therefore let's stick to them. If we do that, then I think we can face the future with new confidence.

The PRESIDENT. In a word, we want to stay strong and will stay vigilant, but we are not going to extinguish the hope that a new dawn may be coming, even if it rises—the sun rises very, very slowly.

Thank you very much, Foster. It has been a real privilege to hear such a brilliant report on a very significant 2 weeks.

Mr. DULLES. Well, it has been a great opportunity for me, Mr. President, to have this chance to tell you these things.

#### JUSTICE OWEN J. ROBERTS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to join those who earlier paid tribute to Justice Owen J. Roberts. With his passing, I have lost a valued friend of many years. He was a great Justice of the Supreme Court, and a steadfast worker for many worthy international causes.

Born on May 2, 1875, in Philadelphia, Owen Roberts obtained his law degree from the University of Pennsylvania at the age of 20. He gained considerable attention as assistant district attorney of Philadelphia County, as a teacher of law at the University of Pennsylvania, and as a special United States Attorney General under President Coolidge.

In 1930, President Herbert Hoover appointed him to the Supreme Court, where he served with great distinction until his retirement in 1945. A lifelong Republican and a conservative, Owen Roberts never permitted any label to govern his decisions on the Court. During the 1930's his vote often was the deciding one. His vote upheld the Wagner Act and the unemployment provisions of the Social Security Act. He was strongly opposed to the famous Court-packing plan. As a bridge between conservative and liberal thinking in the Court, Justice Roberts' position was a vital one.

In 1942, he was appointed Chairman of the Commission To Investigate the Pearl Harbor Attack.

After his retirement from the Court, Justice Roberts continued to contribute his great talents and energies to many activities. For a time he served as dean of the law school of the University of Pennsylvania. As president of the Atlantic Union Committee, Justice Roberts worked long and hard for peace and for a stronger unity between the United States and the nations of Western Europe.

His was indeed a full and profitable life. His many contributions to a better America and a better world will not soon be forgotten.

Mrs. Smith joins me in expressing deepest sympathies to Mrs. Roberts and to their daughter and two grandchildren.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks editorials on Owen J. Roberts, from the New York Herald Tribune and from the New York Times of May 18.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### OWEN J. ROBERTS

Justice Owen J. Roberts was one of those stalwart, independent characters that in every generation come along to put their special mark on the Supreme Court. A lifelong Republican, appointed by President Hoover in 1930, he eluded classification in any narrow terms. His decisions frequently determined which side of the Court should have the majority, and they could rarely be predicted in advance. His general views seemed to shift as the broad popular thinking of the country came to accept the social legislation of the thirties. He was a judge who upheld precedent and principle; but he was also one of those statesmen who have kept the Supreme Court from falling into a position of sterile obstruction.

Justice Roberts' early career had been marked by brilliance in his studies and by a rapid rise in the fields of both business and education. His experience as a professor of law at the University of Pennsylvania gave him not only the exact legal knowledge which served him in good stead on the Nation's highest court. It also left him with the ability to deliver his opinions clearly, usually from memory, in a style that even the layman could understand. His robust physical energy, lasting into old age, enabled him to accept a heavy load of opinion writing.

The possession by any nation of men of Justice Roberts' independent stripe, whose sound judgment is instinctively trusted, is an invaluable asset. To such as he, when a supreme controversy rages, men can look with confidence for an unbiased appraisal of the facts. And so it was that Justice Roberts was chosen to head the Commission which investigated the disaster at Pearl Harbor. He continued to work after his retirement, promoting causes he believed in, particularly a more effective form of international government than he felt was provided by the United Nations. He died yesterday after a full life, a man whose efforts had won him great success and whose qualities had won the universal respect of his fellow countrymen.

#### OWEN J. ROBERTS

The career of Justice Owen J. Roberts as a member of the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States for 15 years, as a successful lawyer in Philadelphia before and after his judicial service, as a prosecutor in connection with the Teapot Dome scandal, as chairman of the commission to investigate what happened at Pearl Harbor, and as a leading figure in many public, educational, and communal causes, was one in which the bench and bar of this country may well take pride. He possessed complete intellectual integrity and was a most conscientious workman.

His service on the bench encompassed the era which dealt with much of the early New Deal legislation of the Roosevelt administration. Although Justice Roberts had always been a conservative Republican, it soon became evident that his conclusions on the bench resulted from independent judgment in each instance, with a minimum of political or philosophical prejudice.

After Justice Roberts retired from the Supreme Court bench, he served for a while as dean of the Law School of the University of Pennsylvania, and his subsequent activities identified him with causes which in his judgment would advance the cause of peace

in the world and benefit his native land. His was a broad and a full life, in which he attained the pinnacle of his profession and maintained always the respect and confidence of those with whom he worked and lived. Dying yesterday at the ripe age of 80, he still leaves a void.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, in common with my colleagues in the Senate I was deeply grieved to learn of the death of Owen J. Roberts, a great American, and a distinguished son of Pennsylvania, who served for 15 years as an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

Justice Roberts passed away Tuesday, May 17, at the age of 80.

Owen Roberts possessed one of the most brilliant legal minds of our country. In addition to his distinguished career on the bench and at the bar, he achieved outstanding distinction as an educator, as a leader in religious affairs, and as the author of many books and articles dealing with the Constitution.

He was a life trustee of the University of Pennsylvania, where he served for 20 years as a teacher of law, and later as dean of the law school.

In 1946, he was elected president of the house of deputies of the Protestant Episcopal Church, the first layman ever to achieve that high honor.

He took an active part in many civic and charitable activities, in which his able leadership was an inspiration to all who were associated with him.

Justice Roberts retired from the Supreme Court bench in 1945, after participating in decisions which had tremendous importance in shaping the course of our Nation.

In recent years Justice Roberts directed his talents to the field of international affairs, working to promote peace and better understanding among the free nations of the world.

To the members of his family, I extend my deepest sympathy.

#### ALLEGATIONS OF IMPROPER ADVERTISING OF OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, when the Federal taxes and certain restrictions on oleomargarine colored to resemble butter were removed, many of us were greatly concerned, not only because of the effect on our great dairy industry, but also because of the danger of violations of fair-trade practices on the part of an industry which has sought to invade the dairy markets and trade on the age-long public acceptance of butter as an essential food in the human diet.

There have been many reports of such practices, which we foresaw if oleomargarine was allowed to be manufactured and sold in a form made artificially to resemble butter in color, texture, and taste.

We are confronted at this time with depressed prices in dairy products, so serious as to present a national problem in our farm economy.

Certainly a very large contributing factor has been the fact that the dairy producer, who is entirely dependent on the income from a dairy herd, has been forced into competition with a product which may taste the same and look the same, but is not the same as butter.

No one proposes prohibiting the sale of oleomargarine as a food product; but it should stand on its own, as such, and should not masquerade as butter.

In three recent cases, where violations of the limited restrictions placed on oleomargarine were alleged, the Federal Trade Commission, for the first time, has noted that certain oleomargarine manufacturers are using advertising which implies that their brands are dairy products. Two of these manufacturers were ordered to stop these practices. A third case was sent back to the examiners, for new hearings.

These decisions of the Federal Trade Commission, announced Monday, are significant and important. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the press announcement of the Federal Trade Commission, outlining the action taken with reference to the three cases of alleged improper advertising of oleomargarine, be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION, Washington, D. C.

For the first time, the Federal Trade Commission today issued decisions under the new oleomargarine amendment to the Federal Trade Commission Act. Two oleomargarine manufacturers were ordered to stop using advertising which, by the use of dairy terms, conveys that their brands are dairy products within the meaning of the act. In a third action, the Commission concluded that the advertising by another company may be unlawful, and remanded the case to the hearing examiner for further proceedings.

In opinions by Chairman Edward F. Howrey accompanying two of the decisions, the Commission explored in detail the legislative history of the oleomargarine amendment and concluded that "It was intended, we believe, to reach a form of advertising which through suggestion, the association of ideas, and the use of dairy terms may lead the consumer to believe that the oleomargarine in question is a dairy product." All three of the decisions were reached by a unanimous Commission.

Cease and desist orders were issued against the maker of Farm Queen, E. F. Drew & Co., Inc., 15 East 26th Street, New York City, and the maker of Reddi-Spread, Reddi-Spread Corp., 311 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. In the third case the Commission reversed a hearing examiner's initial decision dismissing a complaint against the Blanton Co., 3400 North Wharf, St. Louis, Mo., which sells Creamo.

In the case involving Farm Queen the Commission found that such statements in advertising as "Churned to delicate, sweet creamy goodness," "The same day-to-day freshness which characterizes our other dairy products," represented or suggested that Farm Queen is a dairy product. In the case of Reddi-Spread, the Commission found misleading the emphasis in advertising on the unknown percentage of butter in this oleo coupled with the statement that it shouldn't be confused with ordinary margarine because of its butter content.

In remanding the Creamo product case for further proceedings, the Commission stated that certain advertising, as well as the name Creamo, standing alone, might lead people to believe this oleomargarine is a dairy product.

Involved in each of these cases is the 1950 oleomargarine amendment of the FTC act. This amendment, section 15 (a) (2) of the FTC act, declares misleading any represen-

tation, "made or suggested by statement, word, grade designation, design, device, symbol, sound, or any combination thereof," that oleomargarine is a dairy product.

Discussing this law in the Commission's opinion in the Drew Co. case, Chairman Howrey said, "The real purpose of the amendment seems to be \* \* \* to stop the practice of suggesting that oleomargarine is a dairy product by associating it with dairy terms \* \* \*. It was intended, we believe, to reach a form of advertising, which, through suggestion and the association of ideas, leads or may lead the customer to believe that the particular oleomargarine in question is a dairy product."

Referring to the Blanton Co. case, the Chairman stated, "We are not dealing here with the usual misrepresentation case, that is, with false and misleading advertising which may have the tendency or capacity to deceive in violation of section 5 of the FTC Act, but solely with the question whether or not the respondent has through the use of any [of the methods named in the oleomargarine amendment] suggested that the oleomargarine sold by it is a 'dairy product'."

In the Drew Co. case, the Commission affirmed with modification an initial decision by Examiner Everett F. Haycraft, issued July 29, 1954. Granting an appeal from that decision by counsel supporting the complaint, the Commission included among the prohibitions in the order the use of the phrase "country fresh."

This phrase, among others prohibited by today's order, is contained in handbills, leaflets, and other advertising devices. Among the statements made are these:

"Farm Queen margarine \* \* \* is always country fresh \* \* \*."

"Starting now our drivers will have it for you with the same day-to-day freshness which characterizes our other dairy products."

"\* \* \* Churned to delicate sweet creamy goodness."

In the case of Reddi-Spread Corp., the Commission reversed an initial decision by Examiner Abner E. Lipscomb dated October 29, 1954, which dismissed the complaint.

In that case the Commission found that certain statements in the firm's advertising suggest "that while it is technically oleomargarine it is actually a dairy product." Typical of the challenged advertisements used in newspapers, on television, and through other channels is the claim:

"Reddi-Spread Brand \* \* \* a premium oleomargarine containing not only vegetable fats but also real fresh butter \* \* \*. Yes; it's the butter that makes it taste better \* \* \* that's why we say, 'Don't confuse ordinary margarine with Reddi-Spread. Compare it with any spread at any price \* \* \*'. Compare, but don't confuse Reddi-Spread with ordinary margarine."

The Commission concluded that the fact Reddi-Spread is called oleomargarine in these ads does not preclude the suggestion that it is a dairy product.

On this point Chairman Howrey, in the Drew case, after reviewing legislative debate on the oleomargarine amendment, stated: "The whole controversy leading up to amended section 15 of the Federal Trade Commission Act seems to be based on the assumption that the word 'oleomargarine' is not by itself a sufficient negation; in other words, Congress seems to have conclusively presumed that many people think that the product, even when described by its correct name, is a dairy product and that the use of the name 'oleomargarine' does not prevent it from being palmed off to the public as such."

Reversing Examiner Haycraft's decision of November 8, 1954, in the Blanton Co. case which dismissed the complaint after the close of the case in chief of counsel supporting the complaint, the Commission held that such statements as "better tasting because



it's made better with sweet fresh milk plus pure cream," standing alone without qualification "might well lead some people to believe that the product is a dairy product."

In this case Chairman Howrey observed: "If all the advertising under scrutiny which used the name 'Creamo' or the terms 'milk' and 'cream' had clearly and conspicuously stated the percentages of cream and milk contained in the product, then they would have been sufficiently informative and would adequately have negated any suggestion that respondent's 'oleomargarine' \* \* \* is a dairy product."

The chairman noted that some advertisements and radio continuity did include the statement, "contains 5 percent light cream."

According to the Oleomargarine Act its prohibitions do not "prevent a truthful, accurate, and full statement in \* \* \* advertisement of all the ingredients contained in \* \* \* oleomargarine \* \* \*."

This case was remanded to Hearing Examiner Haycraft "for further consideration in accordance with this opinion and [the opinion in the Drew Co. case]."

The orders in the Drew Co. case and the Reddi-Spred Co. case in addition to containing the prohibition against representing or suggesting that margarine is a dairy product provide:

"That nothing contained in this order shall prevent the use in advertisements of a truthful, accurate, and full statement of all the ingredients contained in said product, or of a truthful statement that said product contains butter or any other dairy product provided the percentage thereof contained is clearly and conspicuously set forth."

The complaint against E. F. Drew & Co., Inc., was issued October 19, 1953; the complaint against Blanton Co., March 18, 1954; the complaint against Reddi-Spred, June 30, 1954.

#### RETIREMENT OF FEDERAL JUDGE ALBERT L. WATSON, MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, 26 years ago, when I served as Republican State chairman of Pennsylvania, I had the pleasure of recommending Albert L. Watson, an able and distinguished jurist, for appointment to the Federal bench in the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

Judge Watson has just submitted his resignation as Chief Judge to President Eisenhower. I call his retirement to the attention of the Senate because his outstanding service to his State and the Nation is deserving of the greatest praise.

His unswerving devotion to the highest principles of his profession honored the bench on which he served. Pennsylvania is proud of Judge Watson. I am happy to join the citizens of the Keystone State in extending to him our wholehearted and sincere appreciation and our best wishes for many years of health and happiness.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in my remarks an article from the Scranton (Pa.) Tribune which reviews Judge Watson's brilliant career.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### JURIST USED FRANK, HAPPY PHILOSOPHY

Federal Judge Albert L. Watson has the happy faculty of being able to blend cracker-barrel philosophy with the candor of a prizefighter.

When he addressed a class of 34 new citizens January 12, 1949, in his court, here, he

told them, in effect, to punch any Red on the jaw if they heard him run down the United States Government.

His recommendation to "use physical force" hit the headlines and made the Russian press, drawing a bitter reply from Pravda, the Communist Party newspaper in Moscow.

By the same token, he can be mild and mellow, as when he made this statement, December 20, 1954: "Being happy is not only a right, as held by the Declaration of Independence, it is also a duty which we owe to ourselves and to others."

At each yearly milestone, he usually had a statement for news reporters on his outlook on life.

On December 5, 1951, when Scranton was in the throes of major industrial rehabilitation, he declared: "Scranton will never die because its people have faith and courage and the will to do things."

On November 20, 1952, when reports buzzed he was ready to retire, he said this: "My health is perfect, I enjoy my work, and I have given no thought whatsoever to stepping down."

Perhaps he best exemplified his philosophy when he said on December 1, 1953: "I believe that nowadays the things to put aside for one's old age is all thoughts of retirement."

Then he said this was his "code," called "Things to Remember"—"The belief in God beyond everything, the value of hope, the virtue of tolerance, the spiritual quality of true courtesy, the sound of laughter, the pleasure of work, the God-given beauty of flowers, the challenge of life, the good fortune of having good friends, the thrill of seeing justice done, the responsibility of citizenship, and the preservation of freedom."

Judge Watson has been an indefatigable worker. He once told a reporter the first case he tried when he became a Federal jurist already had been on the books for 12 years.

In one year, he also remarked, he turned out 83 opinions, including those of former Judge Albert W. Johnson, one-time colleague on the bench, who was off sick.

During 1954, for example, he handled 57 out of 151 cases, several of them major crime cases. From July 1953, to July 1954, he wrote 18 out of 40 opinions handed down by himself, and Judges John W. Murphy and Frederick V. Follmer.

He says there is no backlog of cases in this district. "It's current, and I'm glad," he remarked.

Judge Watson was born December 6, 1876, at Montrose, the son of Willoughby W. Watson, a lawyer, and Annie Marie Kemmerer. He was reared in the Mauch Chunk area, went to the School of Lackawanna here, and later to Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J., where he was editor of the school paper and literary magazine, was in the Banjo Club and Dramatic Club.

He was a debater and a letter winner in baseball and football and was captain of the Dickinson House Championship football team.

He went to Amherst College, Amherst, Mass., earned his B. S. degree in 1901, and joined Psi Upsilon fraternity. There, too, he was a debater and was on the declamation team, also winning his letter in baseball and football.

He studied law with the firm of Watson, Diehl, Hall & Kemmerer and later joined the firm.

Judge Watson was admitted to the Lackawanna County courts December 15, 1902, to Orphans Court, on motion of his father, in the same month, and to the United States District Court, March 31, 1905.

On March 3, 1908, he was admitted to the Superior Court; May 4, 1908, to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, and March 31, 1909, to the circuit court of appeals.

In 1917 he was named to a Commission On Investigation of Various Systems of Re-

cording Deeds, Mortgages, etc., for the State of Pennsylvania. In 1923 he was counsel for the Workmen's Compensation Bureau, and the same year was a trustee and president of the Board at Scranton State Hospital.

Judge Watson was named to the Lackawanna County bench in 1926 by the late Gov. Gifford Pinchot, and in 1929 was appointed by former President Hoover to the Federal bench in this Middle District.

He is a member of Westminster Presbyterian Church and was a deacon of Second Presbyterian Church before its merger into the present congregation. He is a member of the American Bar Association, the Pennsylvania bar and Lackawanna bar.

Judge Watson is a 32d degree Mason, a member of Peter Williamson Lodge of Masons, Irem Temple of the Shrine, and of the Alumni Council of Lawrenceville School.

He is also a member of the University Club of New York City and the Waverly Country Club.

His first wife, Mabel E. Watson, whom he married in 1902, died in 1923, and in 1930 he married Effie Woodville Watson, who was socially prominent in New Orleans, where Judge Watson frequently has held court.

He has two sons, Albert Leisenring Watson, Jr., and Righter Watson, and a stepson, Navy Capt. J. L. Warren Woodville, Jr., who is stationed near Paris, with Supreme Headquarters, American Expeditionary Forces (SHEAF).

#### DELAYS IN DISTRIBUTION OF SALK VACCINE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for not to exceed 4 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from California may proceed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it seems to me that it is high time that a number of misapprehensions about the Salk poliomyelitis vaccine and the activities of the Public Health Service and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are clarified.

It would be a matter of regret to me, and to many millions of American parents, if this subject should become involved in partisan politics.

If this were to happen, it would create and foster needless uncertainty with respect to the vaccine's value and safety.

Moreover, it would make the efforts of all who are working with the problem—scientists, manufacturers, and public administrators—doubly difficult. Is it not time to reassess the situation and take a calm look at it?

In the first place, let me say that I have the assurance of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service that there is no new ban on the vaccine, the headline of a local morning newspaper to the contrary withstanding.

In her report to the President last Monday, Secretary Hobby clearly stated:

Safety of the vaccine must be the paramount consideration; and the questions relating to safety in quantity production must be determined by the best scientific advice, uninfluenced by any other factors.

Furthermore, Surgeon General Scheele has repeatedly laid emphasis on safety.

What are the facts? On April 27, after 6 cases of paralytic polio appeared following vaccination with the product of 1 manufacturer, the Public Health Service acted swiftly and decisively. In

the interests of the children of America, it banned use of further lots of that company's vaccine.

After long and careful consultations with the most eminent medical and scientific experts in America, including the discoverer of the vaccine himself, Dr. Jonas Salk, the Public Health Service concluded—again in the interest of safety—that a doublecheck of the manufacturing and testing processes of all manufacturers should be undertaken.

The inspections of two manufacturers have been completed and vaccine released. The Surgeon General has said that the study of other manufacturers is proceeding as rapidly as possible. In the interest of the children of America, again, the Surgeon General has emphasized that this process will move as rapidly as is necessary to get the job done properly, but no more rapidly.

I am sure I speak for millions of Americans in applauding this decision.

With respect to the vaccine of the Cutter Laboratories which is under suspension, I am advised by the Surgeon General that samples of the finished vaccine and samples from key stages in the production are now undergoing exhaustive testing at the National Institutes of Health. I have every faith that this study will be completed as rapidly as possible.

Here are some further facts about this reappraisal:

The Public Health Service staff has held extensive consultations with experts in virology and immunology, both before and after April 12. It has also conferred with the technical personnel of vaccine manufacturers to explore all steps in the manufacturing and testing process to evaluate recent experiences. Surely this is in the tradition of reasoned, scientific caution.

As of May 13, announcement had been made that the Public Health Service had cleared 4,250,000 cubic centimeters of Parke Davis Co. vaccine. After a team visit to the Eli Lilly Co. plant, it was announced that all previously cleared lots of their vaccine, amounting to 3,600,000 cubic centimeters, were cleared. Both these clearances were immediately made known to the public.

Earlier this week a team from the National Institutes of Health and a consultant visited the Wyeth Laboratories, Inc., in Marietta, Pa., and a team is now at the Pittman-Moore Co. in Zionsville, Ind.

The Public Health Service has announced, following press inquiries yesterday, that it intends to complete its visit to Pittman-Moore and to await further information on Wyeth vaccine before it makes any announcement of further clearances.

It is difficult for me to understand why some individuals seek to create public confusion by not accepting these facts and letting the Public Health Service continue its review in accordance with the high scientific principles which have traditionally guided it.

Let me make this clear. I am advised by the Surgeon General that the Public Health Service has not called a halt in the vaccination program. It has not

banned vaccine again. These are the facts.

Headlines and political speeches do not change them. It is difficult for me, as it must be for millions of parents, to understand why, at a time like this, anyone should attempt to play upon the emotions of American mothers and fathers for partisan reasons or in careless disregard of the facts, and in so doing, discredit this wonderful vaccine.

I have faith in the conscientiousness and integrity of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and his professional staff. I accept his counsel and judgment on poliomyelitis problems. I am willing to accept delays, in the interests of sound scientific decisions. We need caution rather than headstrong action, calm and objective thinking rather than hysteria, rational scientific advice rather than political propaganda. Any injection of politics into this situation is not only unwarranted, but it is contemptuous of the high art and science of medicine. It serves to hinder and obstruct the careful analysis which is necessary to safeguard the health and safety of American children. That is the first consideration of the Surgeon General. I submit that it is the only consideration which we, as Members of Congress, can countenance.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, let me say to the Senator that it was my privilege to attend the hearings at which this subject matter was discussed. I also believe that it is of the utmost importance that this vital issue, pertaining to the health of the American people, particularly children, be considered carefully, prudently, and in a thoroughly objective manner.

However, I should like to ask the Senator 1 or 2 questions. I have hesitated to ask these questions, but I think they are called for.

Why was it that, in respect to this vaccine, the United States Public Health Service did not institute early the kind of tests which it subsequently instituted?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator that I do not have all the scientific reasons. However, as I understand, tests were conducted, not only by the Public Health Service, but also by the Institute of Poliomyelitis, which has done such effective work in this field, as well as by Dr. Salk himself.

As I recall, the data finally released indicated that the vaccine would not necessarily be 100 percent effective. In fact, the very first report indicated that it might not be 100 percent effective. In other words, until further inoculations were made, a certain number of cases of poliomyelitis might develop, but scientifically, they would not be any greater than the apparent possibilities indicated by the tests made by Dr. Salk and other doctors. It may be that if a person who had contracted poliomyelitis was given a shot of vaccine, the shot could act as a booster, as I understand. I am told that there is a possibility of such a thing happening. I do not mean that poliomyelitis might develop from the shot alone,

but the shot might expedite the development of the disease.

However, whatever the reason may be, when additional cases of polio developed, I believe the Public Health Service was on sound ground in taking the extra precaution of retesting the vaccine and re-examining the situation, to determine whether additional precautionary steps should be taken.

I am told that in the development of vaccines, it is not an unusual situation for vaccine to be reexamined and retested.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I concur with that statement of the Senator from California. However, I respectfully suggest to him that in the tests of 1954 every batch of vaccine was tested three times, in the laboratories of the National Institutes of Health, at the Salk laboratory, and at the manufacturer's laboratory. Extensive tests were made at those three laboratories.

I further respectfully suggest that in 1955, so I have been informed, one test is made, and that test is conducted at the manufacturer's laboratory. Nothing further was done until the Cutter Laboratory vaccine was found to be defective. That discovery alerted the Public Health Service to the necessity of further tests.

I also respectfully suggest that the Public Health Service now feels compelled to institute a much more intensive testing procedure than it had originally planned to undertake at the beginning.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Minnesota may be more scientifically capable than the Public Health Service. However, I remind the Senator that the Public Health Service has not been built up on any partisan basis. It has been built up under both Republican and Democratic administrations. Certainly the Service has competent and efficient men on its staff. I will not quarrel with the Public Health Service if it believes that out of a super abundance of caution it wishes to retest or reexamine its processes with relation to the polio vaccine.

As the Senator knows, the first and most important thing to consider is the effect of the vaccine on the children of the country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have no more time to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be granted 2 more minutes, so that we may conclude this colloquy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say to the Senator from California that what the junior Senator from Minnesota is talking about is the procedure being followed to assure the efficacy and the safety of the vaccine. That is the most important factor.

I am sure our laboratories are doing everything they can to assure safety and



efficacy. I feel, however, that there has not been, on the part of our Government laboratories, the fullest followthrough in terms of testing the vaccine that we had a right to expect.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I feel very keenly about this matter. I have a 7-year-old son who has already been inoculated. He is supposed to have his second inoculation on the 27th of May. Judging by press reports, it is apparent that there is a great deal of uncertainty about this whole matter. Certainty should have been established on the day of the release of the vaccine. We have had far too much "in and out" and "up and down," and "release and holding back" on this very important subject, to the point where it has caused grave public concern.

All I am asking is that there be the fullest examination and the fullest testing of the vaccine so that the American people may be reassured.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think that is precisely what Dr. Scheele and other Public Health officers are endeavoring to do. But, as I understand, a scientist in the medical profession never freezes his thinking. I do not believe he should.

If after what appeared to be adequate tests—and I do not believe that the Public Health officials would have released any vaccine if they had not felt the tests of it had been adequate—there was even the remotest possibility of room for improvement by further tests of the vaccine, it was proper that such further tests be made, rather than that Public Health officials should freeze their thought on the subject. Accordingly, I believe the Public Health Service did precisely the right thing by calling a halt to the distribution and, in effect, saying, "We want to doublecheck the vaccine."

I can find no quarrel with that procedure or point of view. I would rather have the Public Health Service do that than to say that there is no room for improvement. That line of thinking would not be in keeping with the principle of scientific research. I hope that we shall continue to improve the vaccine over the years.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let us not have any charges made of politics. I have three children within the age group of the vaccination. When I express my legitimate concern as to the efficacy and safety of the vaccine I do not want anyone to say that I am playing politics.

The best way to keep politics out of the matter is to make sure that every statement which comes from the Public Health Service and from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will not be retracted within 24 hours. There has been too much up and down and in and out on this matter.

I respectfully suggest further that a sufficient explanation has not been given. I should like to know whether the vaccine which is now being used is

exactly the same vaccine which was previously tested.

I shall have further conversations and discussions in regard to this subject. I have been delving into this matter, as Dr. Scheele knows. I shall have further conferences with leading officials of the Public Health Service. I know a little bit about vaccine control. I desire to make clear, too, that I am not speaking only as a Senator but also as a father of 3 boys aged 7, 11, and 13 years.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Minnesota, the reason I was concerned with this matter was that I read an article published in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald. I immediately contacted the Public Health Service and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to get the facts. I have stated the facts as they have been made known to me. The newspaper article is not an accurate presentation, and it may very well cause a great deal of alarm among parents. I fully agree with the Senator from Minnesota that we are entitled to have the facts. We should have only the facts. Certainly we should not have, for whatever the purpose may be—either because of misinformation or because of politics—a disturbing of the situation when the whole subject is in the competent hands of the Public Health Service.

Mr. SCHOEPPLE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] in his remarks on this very important subject.

Mr. NEUBERGER subsequently said: Mr. President, before presenting the material which I intend to submit, I should like to say to the distinguished minority leader that I agree with his recent remarks that politics should not be introduced into the vital issue of the Salk vaccine. I have been corresponding with an official of the nation to the north, Canada, which also has been considering this problem; and, following the morning hour, I expect to make some very brief comments on how we can learn from Canada's methods of developing and distributing the Salk vaccine. I hope the distinguished minority leader will not have any business to call him elsewhere, because I should like him to hear how Canada handles the problem.

#### THE ARMY'S NEW COMMAND MANAGEMENT SCHOOL AT FORT BELVOIR, VA.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be granted 2 minutes beyond the regular allotment of time to speak with reference to the Army's new Command Management School at Fort Belvoir, Va.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and the Senator from Connecticut may proceed for 4 minutes.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, recently it was my pleasure to participate in the program of the Army's new Command Management School at Fort Belvoir, Va. I should like to share with the Senate some of my thoughts and ob-

servations on this stimulating and encouraging experience.

As civilians we have in the past tended to regard the function of our Armed Forces as essentially limited to their activities in the event of war and quite ignored their responsibility for our continuing defense in peacetime. In recent years, however, this dual attitude has been abandoned, for the world situation demands that we maintain effective and coordinated military forces. Even a country so magnificently endowed as is ours does not have unlimited resources at its disposal. Therefore, economy of resources, both material and human, is a most important requisite for our national security.

We in the Senate have recognized this fact, and once again the Army has demonstrated clearly and practically its understanding of, and concern for, this elemental truth. With the establishment of the Command Management School, the Army is looking forward to the same success in the handling of its resources in nontactical missions as it has achieved in combat on so many battlefields scattered throughout the world. To insure this accomplishment and its related contribution to the combat effectiveness of our ground forces, the school has been placed under the jurisdiction of Gen. John E. Dahlquist, commanding general of the Continental Army Command, with the technical assistance and advice of Lt. Gen. Laurin L. Williams, comptroller of the Army.

At the Command Management School the Army makes available to its senior officers and key civilian officials, and indeed to selected representatives of all the Armed Forces, advanced business management trends, techniques and training which will assist them considerably in fulfilling their increasingly complex and vital responsibilities.

Today the Army finds itself engaged in the operation of many large scale business type activities; indeed, the Army and its activities constitute our country's largest business. This means that our military leaders must be familiar with business management as well as military strategy and tactics. The Command Management School was established to fill this real need.

Fort Belvoir, with its excellent facilities and proximity to the seat of government, was selected as the site for the Command Management School, which, I am sure, will enhance the already splendid reputation of that efficient installation. Fort Belvoir, as Senators know, is the Army's engineer center. Also located there under the fine leadership of Maj. Gen. Louis W. Prentiss and his capable Chief of Staff Brig. Gen. Max S. Johnson are the Engineer School, the Army's oldest school, and the Engineer Research and Development Laboratories. Because of the availability of suitable academic and administrative accommodations and the warm personal support of General Prentiss and General Johnson, the Command Management School has a fine opportunity to grow and to develop to the utmost its great potential.

A native of the great State of Connecticut, Col. Frank Kowalski, Jr., is commandant of the school. He and his

carefully selected staff and faculty have performed their duties in such an exemplary fashion that in the short space of 7 months, the Command Management School has proved its worth so significantly that it has been established as a permanent activity with the Army school system.

Every 4 weeks a new class of about 50 senior officers and ranking civilian officials, each with many years of valuable experience, is assembled at the school for the 3-week course. Under the guidance of the faculty, they pool their knowledge and experience to enlarge their comprehension of the nontactical management problems that are so much a part of our Armed Forces. Their discussions and the problems considered are practical and realistic and so are the solutions presented by the class members. Efficiency, economy, increased production constitute the omnipresent theme in their work, a theme that we in the Senate can readily appreciate.

The keen interest and enthusiasm of the class participants, their willing acceptance of new procedures and techniques clearly indicate that for these men the learning process has not yet ended. The test for ideas is not their conformity to the traditional approach to Army management but rather whether or not they will work.

As a result of the advanced instruction they receive, graduates of the Command Management School are equipped positively to assist in the elimination of the extraneous and wasteful, while, at the same time, substantially contributing to the fighting effectiveness of our Armed Forces. The motto of the Command Management School has living meaning for this new contribution to our national security and might well be accepted by all of us: From knowledge the power of decision.

I am very greatly honored, Mr. President, by being given an opportunity to present this statement.

#### MISS MARGARET PERRY, OF MONMOUTH, OREG., HONORED AS TEACHER OF THE YEAR FOR 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, we of the State of Oregon are justifiably proud of Margaret Perry, of Monmouth, Oreg., who has been selected as the 1955 teacher of the year by McCall's magazine. Our country is only going to be as good as the next generation of Americans can make it. Miss Perry is one of those unselfish individuals who are helping to prepare the coming generation for citizenship and a useful life ahead.

Margaret Perry, who is a personal friend of both Mrs. Neuberger and myself, has been accompanied to Washington by two pupils selected by vote of her fourth-grade class. They are Sue Mull and Frank Richard (Dickie) Peterson. The editors of McCall's have arranged a high honor in behalf of Miss Perry and her students, for they were received at the White House today by the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Recognizing the great importance of teachers to the Nation, McCall's maga-

zine has honored an outstanding teacher each year for the past decade. I am happy to report that another teacher mentioned this year is likewise from Oregon, Miss Elsie May Cimino of the Union High School of Hillsboro.

When we contemplate the public service of teachers like Margaret Perry and Elsie May Cimino, it should help to enlighten us toward further popular support of education. It also should serve to convince us that such unjust impositions as special test oaths for schoolteachers are not necessary to assure patriotism in our schools.

My wife and I are proud of the fact that, during our tenure in the Oregon State Legislature, we fought for adequate financial support of education, for special pilot courses for retarded children, for basic school support from State funds for each pupil and against oaths singling out teachers and setting them apart from the rest of the population.

Teachers like Margaret Perry help to justify an unselfish interest in education on the part of every citizen. The June issue of McCall's says:

Margaret Perry is an extraordinary teacher. She is, furthermore, a dedicated teacher. She devotes hours to the education of student teachers.

Knowing Margaret Perry as I do, Mr. President, I am fully aware that she has accepted this high honor as teacher of the year principally because she realizes that she is a symbol of thousands of other teachers who share her devotion to learning, to the ideals of our country and to the future welfare of America's boys and girls.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article about Margaret Perry, entitled "McCall's Teacher of the Year," from the issue of McCall's magazine for June 1955, be reprinted in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MC CALL'S TEACHER OF THE YEAR—FOR 23 YEARS MARGARET PERRY'S CAREER HAS BEEN OTHER PEOPLE'S CHILDREN

The fourth-grade students of the Monmouth Elementary School in Oregon staged a protest at the end of the last school year because their teacher, Miss Margaret Perry, couldn't be promoted to fifth grade along with them. The demonstration wasn't very effective—Miss Perry is still teaching fourth grade—but it was gratifying proof of the affection her pupils have for the woman who has been named McCall's teacher of the year.

This affection and respect is shared by Miss Perry's principal, Dr. William F. Wagner, who says with a broad smile, "If all teachers were like Miss Perry there would be no need for principals." Mothers of the fourth-graders are equally enthusiastic. "I don't know how Miss Perry does it," says a parent who moved to Monmouth last fall, "but this year Ginny likes school. That never happened before." And a student teacher who worked with Miss Perry last year is still talking about her as "the greatest influence for good in my short life."

There seems to be no question about it in Monmouth or among professional educators anywhere else in Oregon: Margaret Perry is an extraordinary teacher. She is, furthermore, a dedicated teacher. Such time as she can spare away from the classroom she gives to a dozen or more organizations which are aimed at improving the standards of the

profession and widening public interest in it. She devotes hours to the education of student teachers. Her conversation and her reading are primarily about education, and most of her close friends are teachers. "But the most important thing I do," says Miss Perry, "is to teach children."

What is it that makes Margaret Perry so unusual a teacher? One factor is certainly her personality. She has an infectious warmth that has a way of spreading over to other people. She has friendly eyes, and a smile that brightens her face and brings an immediate response from those with whom she is speaking. Always calm and apparently easygoing, she has a fine sense of humor and a pleasant, hearty laugh. Her superintendent, Henry Tetz, says, "If Margaret were standing in a group of people you wouldn't notice her particularly. But put her in front of a class of pupils or a gathering of teachers and everyone immediately responds to her."

Anyone watching her class in action can see that response. She has taught her boys and girls to like reading, and because they like it they read well. Enjoy these stories, rather than read them, is her assignment to her students. They can, and often do, get up on their feet and address the class. They know how to work with others. They can originate ideas.

A child arriving in class the first thing in the morning may find a book on his desk that Miss Perry has selected for him. Because Miss Perry is so interested in him the child feels a comfortable self-confidence. The fourth-grader may have something very personal to relate to Miss Perry—about the violin he has with him, a recent visit to the dentist, his haircut, a new rock for the science table collection, a Walt Disney television show. The teacher is genuinely interested.

She listens to troubles, keeps confidences. And she remembers throughout the day that Susie's thoughts may be wandering off to her mother, who is ill, or her father, who's off on a business trip. She makes each one feel that being there makes a difference to the teacher and the class.

This sense of belonging is increased by Miss Perry's emphasis on participation. There are a pupil president, vice-president, secretary, treasurer, host and hostess, and these offices are filled each month by different children elected by the class. Those who hold office, as well as those who don't, have daily functions and responsibilities.

In every subject ("I teach everything from physical education to music," she says), Miss Perry proceeds on the theory that children are eager to learn. There's no satisfaction she knows that quite equals the expression on a child's face when he realizes he has learned something. For this reason she never tires of the children's questions, and she tries painstakingly to answer them. She will work over a subject with a class until she is confident that everyone understands it. "I thought I had a lot of patience," one of her student teachers confessed, "until I saw Miss Perry at work."

Her success in making school a lively experience for her pupils is borne out by the pupils themselves. They love school, and, as any observer in their classroom can see, are in no hurry whatsoever to leave at the end of the school day. One guest was amazed, when he walked into Miss Perry's classroom recently, to find the students actually playing school during a recreation period.

Almost as long as she can remember Margaret Perry, who is now 41, has had the ambition to be a good teacher herself and to help others become good teachers. It started when she entered the first grade in a rural school near Winner, S. Dak., and continued as she began to teach 23 years ago—when she was 18 years old—in a two-



room rural school. Here she had every age and every subject from the 4th through 8th grades. In 1945 she went to Hillsboro, Oreg., to accept an elementary-school job offered by her former superintendent in Winner. Five years later she moved to Monmouth.

One remarkable feature about the Monmouth Elementary School is that it is in one of the few school districts in the country where a teacher may earn more than the majority of her pupils' parents. Miss Perry is paid \$5,000 a year. The average income in this farm community of 5,000 is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$3,500.

The school, which takes its pupils both from Monmouth and the neighboring town of Independence, is affiliated with the Oregon College of Education, and its buildings are right on the college campus. In addition to her fourth-grade duties Miss Perry, along with the majority of her 14 colleagues, teaches student teachers. All the teachers at the school, with one very youthful exception, have a master's degree, and they average 5.3 years of training in education.

Miss Perry cherishes especially two mementos of her career. One is from a 9-year-old named Sammy who arrived very early at school one morning and left a rose on her desk with a note: "To Miss Perry." He suddenly remembered there were two Miss Perrys in the school, so he added a second line: "To big Miss Perry with love from Sammy."

The other is a letter from a former student teacher. "I want to thank you," the letter reads, "for demonstrating to me so clearly what a really good teacher is like. I have gathered a world of materials, but I don't believe they will mean as much to me as your lesson in how a teacher can bring out the good in a class. You have been so human and lovable, and when I get to be a bright light in teaching you will know that you had quite a share in the doing."

### POWER STRUGGLE AT HELLS CANYON

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an excellent article from America, an eminent national weekly magazine. The author, Father Mark J. Fitzgerald is a distinguished economist and a professor at the University of Notre Dame.

Father Fitzgerald has presented the Hells Canyon controversy in a nutshell. Since his deadline, a Federal Power Commission examiner has found that the high dam is the better project. For various dubious reasons based on a rather strange construction of the Federal Power Act, he recommended a license for only one of the Idaho Power Co. dams and dismissal of the applications for the other two small company dams. So when this article is read, it should be noted that the company plan has been rejected in large measure by the FPC examiner. The dam for which a license was recommended would have an installed capacity of only 360,000 kilowatts.

I recommend this article to the Members of the Senate and all citizens concerned about full and wise development of the Nation's natural resources.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### POWER STRUGGLE AT HELLS CANYON

(By Mark J. Fitzgerald)

Congress now has before it legislation (S. 1333) to authorize Federal construction of a high dam on the Snake River in famed Hells

Canyon, Idaho, the deepest gorge in North America. Yet for many months the Federal Power Commission has been weighing arguments, presented in a year-long hearing, for and against the request of a license by a private power company to build three small dams in place of this large Federal dam.

#### THE QUEST FOR KILOWATTS

The Pacific Northwest's hope for freedom from the status of an economic colony controlled by the East lies in its largely untapped resource, falling water. Apart from a declining, seasonal timber industry, and some minerals, there is not much else on which to build an industrial economy. Though the Columbia River Basin in the Northwest, which includes Hells Canyon, has 42 percent of the Nation's hydroelectric power, it is only about one-seventh developed. Thirty million kilowatts of low-priced power could actually be drawn from the rivers of this area, and low-cost kilowatts are the key to increased industrial growth.

If the water resources in the Columbia Basin remain only fractionally developed, over one-tenth of the country's land area will be retarded economically. Already expansion of the electro-process industry, which was hardly known in the Northwest before Grand Coulee Dam was built, has come to a halt because new starts for power dams have not been forthcoming. Industry fears a serious kilowatt shortage within the next decade. The electro-process industry now accounts for over one-third of the total regular consumption of electric power in the Columbia region and is the means by which the area hopes to attain leadership in the production of phosphates, aluminum, and its lighter and stronger rival, titanium.

Present power requirements in the Northwest are expanding every 10 years at over twice the national average. In 1953 it was estimated that energy supplied the Northwestern States by the Bonneville Power Administration was 438 percent above the amount supplied in 1940. The power needs for the entire Nation during that time increased only 212 percent. Since World War II, population has increased almost one-third in the Northwest as against half that percentage for the country. Despite lagging industrial expansion, heavy requirements for electric service by farm and residential users have steadily increased the power consumption in this area since 1945.

To meet the future demand for electric power in the Northwest, almost 11 million kilowatt-hours will have to be available by 1963. Without new construction starts, however, capacity in 1963 will be short of requirements by more than 1 million kilowatt-hours. Moreover, nonindustrial needs will consume all the scheduled power increases during that time. On this basis, the prospect for industrial expansion in the Columbia Basin is a bleak one.

#### TWO PROPOSALS

Consistent with his far-sighted belief that every river should serve the public in as many different ways as possible, President Theodore Roosevelt in 1908 ordered that the Hells Canyon powersite, as part of the forest reserves, be placed under the protection of the Federal Government. It was Theodore Roosevelt's firm conviction that a river system from its headwaters to the sea is a single unit and should be treated as such. The entire Columbia River Basin, of which the Snake River is an important tributary, well illustrates the many purposes which can be served by treating a river as a single system. Hydro-power, flood control, irrigation, and navigation, all can be developed on a vast scale if the water resources of the area are properly balanced and coordinated.

After years of study by the Corps of Army Engineers it became evident to this agency that a high dam at Hells Canyon would be

an essential part of a comprehensive plan of water storage for the Columbia River Basin. This dam would provide maximum storage to impound the high river flow each spring, both to prevent flood damage and to harvest an ample supply of water for the heavy power demands each winter.

Army engineers consider Hells Canyon the strategic site to help avert a recurrence of the disastrous flood of 1894, which, if repeated in our time, would cause damage estimated at \$350 million. Without a coordinated system of storage dams in the Columbia River Basin, the area will remain subject to such divergent calamities as the 1948 flood, which took 50 lives and caused \$100 million in damage, or the fall and winter drought of 1952, which ruined crops and caused industrial unemployment because of the low supply of hydropower.

In the Columbia Basin it is becoming evident that water must be harvested as carefully as any life-giving crop so that it can be used for a variety of purposes before finally reaching the Pacific. Water is wealth, and fortunately can be stored in the mountains by building dams. Otherwise the Northwest could not be sanguine about facing its mounting dependence on this precious commodity.

As an alternative project to the high Federal dam at Hells Canyon, the Idaho Power Co., largely owned in the East, seeks authorization to build three private low dams on the Snake River. If all three of these dams were actually built, they would provide only one-fourth the water storage of 4.4 million acre-feet projected for the Federal dam. Moreover, the three low dams would generate no more than 885,000 kilowatts of power as compared with 1.46 million kilowatts possible with the high dam at Hells Canyon.

These points of difference on storage and power serve to challenge the entire policy of river development laid down by Theodore Roosevelt when he first set down the Nation's conservation program. Multipurpose use of the Snake River for power, irrigation, and flood control would be forever restricted under the three-dam plan. Each year there would be 575,000 kilowatts less power than with the high dam.

To gage the significance of this loss, it may be noted that the economic impact of electric power from Grand Coulee Dam has enabled its operator, the Bonneville Power Administration, to estimate accurately the number of new jobs and households, the value of new investment and tax revenue which can be expected from each additional million of kilowatts added to the Northwest power pool. Using this guide, 575,000 less kilowatts each year would mean 26,000 fewer jobs in industry and about the same number lost in the service trades. Payrolls would fall to expand by \$180 million, and future production would lag by more than one-half billion dollars each year.

The reduction in stored water from the use of the three dams would lower by 570,000 kilowatts the power potential of other dams in the Columbia Basin below Hells Canyon, since water for power production can be used repeatedly as it flows downstream. The yearly value of this amount of power loss has been estimated at over \$11 million. This permanent block to power expansion in the Hells Canyon area would intensify the already predicted power shortage and serve to make power a high-cost commodity, thereby further hampering industrial development.

#### MULTIPURPOSE DEVELOPMENT

The somewhat more than a million acre-feet of water storage possible with the three-dam project would be insufficient as an aid to flood control. In contrast, the Hells Canyon Dam, since it could store over 4 times this amount of water, is listed as 1 of the 5 major reservoirs projected under

the main flood-control plan for the Columbia Basin.

Opponents of the Hells Canyon project have argued that its vastly greater storage capacity would take more water from the Snake River than can be spared in view of the irrigation necessary in southern Idaho. On this point the records of the United States Geological Survey show that there is enough water in the Snake River, in the driest years and after all irrigation diversion, to fill two reservoirs of the size proposed for Hells Canyon.

Studies by independent experts confirm the position that there will be enough water in the Snake River to provide for all demands of irrigation and for the economical operation of Hells Canyon Dam as well. Further, Senate bill 1333 declares that all present and future irrigation rights on the Snake River are safeguarded in the Hells Canyon project, since storage will begin only after irrigation needs are met. Besides irrigation, it is estimated that the reservoir at Hells Canyon, coordinated with other storage dams on the Columbia and the Snake Rivers, will make available in the Columbia Basin 500 miles of low-cost water transportation, a boon to manufacturers and farmers.

#### LONG-RANGE ECONOMY

Estimates by consulting engineer John S. Cotton place the outlay for the Federal Hells Canyon Dam at about \$534 million, compared with approximately \$340 million for the 3-dam project. Mr. Cotton emphasizes, however, that the lower cost of the 3-dam scheme is more than offset by the permanent loss to the Northwest each year of 575,000 kilowatts of regular power with an annual value of \$5.9 million. Judging the 2 projects for economic feasibility, he approves the high dam because it assures full development of power resources.

At the Hells Canyon Dam, the cost per kilowatt-year would be under \$21, compared to almost \$40 with the 3-dam construction. This big difference of \$19 in rates would be a lasting barrier to extensive industrial and irrigation development under the Idaho Power Company plan. Factors helping to explain the lower rate for Hells Canyon power are the superior engineering design, more economical power loads, better pooling of power and long-range planning of transmission service. The oft-cited tax return of almost \$10 million per year predicted from the 3-dam project appears small compared to the loss of tax revenue of 4½ times that amount on income and investment from private enterprise which would be excluded from the area because of the high power rates.

The low power rates under the Federal project, by promoting private investment and employment, assure payment within 50 years of the cost of Hells Canyon Dam plus interest. For similar reasons, other Federal dams in the Northwest such as Bonneville and Grand Coulee are years ahead on their payment schedules, with an interest charge of 5 percent and ample reserves in addition.

Mindful of the long-range benefits at stake, the issue of Hells Canyon should be judged on the basis of whether public authority or a private power concern can better serve the country's interest here. Included in that broad consideration are the many private utility companies themselves, whose low-head dams stand to gain from falling water which would be sent them from the reservoir at Hells Canyon. For private enterprise in general, it should not be forgotten that Grand Coulee, a public project comparable to the Hells Canyon Dam, has done more to encourage expansion of private industry than numbers of small, single-purpose dams privately owned.

Key questions posed about the whole issue of Hells Canyon are whether there shall be maximum or merely fractional development

of our water resources; whether the recommendations in the exhaustive No. 308 Report on the Columbia Basin brought out by the Corps of Army Engineers after years of research shall be followed or scrapped; whether the Pacific Northwest is to expand economically with low-cost power or be hamstrung industrially because of the high price of kilowatts.

Much more is in question than just Hells Canyon itself. If this power source fails of realization, a number of other dams projected in the Columbia Basin may face Congressional rejection because their economic feasibility depends on coordination with Hells Canyon. In a larger sense the national conservation policy first set forth over 50 years ago is facing serious danger. Invaluable power sites throughout the Nation, which have long been under public protection as part of the Federal conservation program, may become easy prizes for private exploitation at public expense.

Should the Federal Power Commission rule in favor of the 3-dam project it would be tantamount to discarding the historic principle laid down by Theodore Roosevelt, and later made part of the Federal Power Act. This states that for successful development of our waterways we should follow a general plan prepared by the best experts in the field and providing for every potential use of a river. Congress could still set aside an FPC ruling for the 3-dam project by directly authorizing construction of Hells Canyon Dam. In the same legislation it could, for future guidance of the Commission, reaffirm in even more emphatic language what is meant by a full and comprehensive development of water resources.

#### PROPOSED AGREEMENT FOR CO-OPERATION WITH NATO CONCERNING ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on May 4 the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy filed its report (No. 267) with the Senate on the proposed Agreement for Cooperation with NATO. This proposed agreement was to be signed on NATO's behalf by 14 countries.

On May 12, 1955, Secretary Wilson informed our committee that Germany would also sign this document since it had been admitted to NATO on May 6. In the opinion of Mr. Wilson, this makes no change in the proposed agreement requiring resubmission to the Joint Committee.

I request unanimous consent to have Secretary Wilson's letter printed in the RECORD at this point in order to complete the public record with respect to this proposed agreement for cooperation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,  
Washington, May 12, 1955.

HON. CLINTON ANDERSON,  
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: On April 13, 1955, the President, pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy a proposed agreement for cooperation with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization regarding atomic information. This agreement will be with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the text provides that it will be signed on behalf of the Organization by the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty.

After the proposed agreement, as submitted by the President, has been before

the joint committee for the 30-day statutory period, the agreement should be signed by all of the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty. On this basis, it will come into effect when all of the parties to the Treaty have given notification to the United States that they are bound by the terms of the agreement as is required by paragraph 1 of article VI of the agreement.

On April 1, the Senate gave its advice and consent to German accession to the North Atlantic Treaty, and on May 6, 1955, the Federal Republic became the 15th member of NATO.

In view of the foregoing, and after consideration of the legal aspects of this situation, the Acting Secretary of State and I have determined that Germany should sign the proposed agreement at the end of this month along with the other 14 NATO members.

Sincerely yours,

C. E. WILSON.

#### ENDORSEMENT OF POSTAL PAY BILL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of a telegram relating to the postal pay increase bill. The letter was sent to President Eisenhower by Donald S. Leonard, who was the Republican nominee for Governor of Michigan last year. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter sent to me by Mr. W. C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers.

There being no objection, the telegram and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,

The President, Washington, D. C.:

I am confident that your approval of S. 1, providing for a long overdue and much deserved pay increase for postal employees will receive the overwhelming endorsement of Michigan citizens who are in sympathy with the plight of the postman and favor a realistic consideration of his wage problem consistent with other governmental and industry pay advances.

As the 1954 Republican nominee for governor, I feel that the national administration should support the action of the Congress especially when it is considered that the percentage differential of this bill over other proposals only amounts to the cost of one quart of milk daily per employee.

DONALD S. LEONARD.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF  
LETTER CARRIERS,

Washington, D. C., May 17, 1955.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Attached hereto is a copy of a very interesting telegram sent to President Eisenhower under date of May 14. You had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Donald S. Leonard in the Senate reception room today.

Mr. Leonard, the Republican nominee for Governor of Michigan last year, is very sincere in his support of the postal-pay measure presently in the White House. The thought occurs that it would be wholesome indeed if you could possibly insert the telegram in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at your convenience.

With kind regards and all good wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours,

W. C. DOHERTY,  
President.



## THE PRESIDENT'S ROAD PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD certain editorials commenting on the President's road plan.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal of February 28, 1955]

### LET'S KNOW WHERE WE ARE GOING ON HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Some of President Eisenhower's enthusiasm for a giant highway-construction program seems to have drained away.

Last July the administration's \$50 billion "grand plan" set the Governors of the 48 States back on their heels when it was presented by Vice President Nixon at their annual conference. But last week the President's message to Congress was a mild recitation of highway needs and a hesitant endorsement of the controversial financing scheme proposed by the Presidential Highway Study Committee headed by Gen. Lucius Clay.

Mr. Eisenhower accepted the Clay committee's estimate that Federal, State, and local governments should spend \$101 billion in the next 10 years on highway construction. He accepted the further recommendation that Federal spending of \$31 billion be concentrated primarily on the key 40,000-mile interstate highway system. But then he dumped into the lap of Congress the most important problem of all—how the Federal share should be financed.

The Clay committee had recommended a Federal highway corporation to float \$20 billion in 30-year bonds. These bonds would be outside the Federal debt—yet would have to be paid off by annual appropriations from Congress.

The president didn't wholly embrace this scheme, perhaps because it had been denounced by Senator BYRD, of Virginia, and other Democrats. His message said only that he was "inclined to the view that it is sounder to finance this program by special bond issues. . . . Yet Congress was offered no alternative guidance.

Since the problem is so largely back where it started, the most searching study of the whole program is warranted. Few will deny that our highways are in bad shape. The Federal Government has a primary interest in the interstate system which links 90 percent of the population centers of 50,000 or more and carries 20 percent of the rural traffic. But with demands for defense, education, and other needs so pressing, dare we go overboard on highway construction?

Rebuilding our highways is not going to be cheap and easy for the Federal, State, or local governments. Hocus-pocus financing, such as the Clay committee recommended and the President is "inclined to," won't solve the money problem by trying to cover it up.

Let's first make absolutely certain what our legitimate needs are, then build soundly and economically for both present and future.

[From the Portland (Maine) Express of February 24, 1955]

### SOMETHING SMELLY HERE

To finance the Federal Government's share of a proposed multi-billion-dollar highway building program, the Eisenhower administration proposes establishing a Federal Highway Corporation. The corporation would be empowered to issue bonds. The bonds would not be considered a part of the national debt, for some reason. The debt limitation law would therefore not apply in this case.

Democratic Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, cites a danger inherent in this type of spending. He sees it as a scheme establishing a precedent that might cause Congress to lose all control over the Federal budget.

The Virginian calls the program inflationary, moreover, at a time when the economy is booming. And it seems to him that the administration "is proposing deficit spending—and I don't know why."

Neither do we. There is a remarkable fishy smell about this whole proposal to take control away from the people's representatives in Congress and vest it in a new corporate authority. What is the big idea?

Why was Congress empowered to set a ceiling over the Federal debt if the Government can set up corporations which borrow money outside of the budget, corporations whose debts are not included in the national total?

Says Senator BYRD:

"If they can set up a corporation to borrow money outside the budget and the debt limit to build roads, they can do anything."

The Senator is right. Once the precedent were established, the Government could set up independent corporations to borrow money for defense plants, housing, airports, collective farms, or projects similar to the Tennessee Valley Authority. Once the corporations were formed, Congress—the elected representatives of the taxpayers—would have little or no control over them. And it would be silly to say the borrowings of such corporations did not constitute a very real part of the public debt.

A big new network of highways would certainly be beneficial, for defense purposes as well as to meet the Nation's growing traffic needs. But it could be argued that we are making fairly good progress in that direction right now—and doing it without Federal pump priming. Gasoline taxes, State and Federal, are bringing in huge sums annually. There is no desperate need to borrow against the future for a Federal superhighway network.

Certainly, if Federal bonds are issued, they should be issued as a part of the Federal budget and included as part of the Federal debt.

Thoughtful Americans will not take kindly to any tricky financial schemes to evade the intent of our budget laws. Such trickery does not square with Mr. Eisenhower's earlier pledges of integrity, economy, and a balanced national budget.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle of February 26, 1955]

### PRESIDENT'S HIGHWAY PROPOSAL IS RUNNING INTO ROUGH SLEDDING

President Eisenhower's \$100 billion Federal highway program is running into all sorts of complications, as could be expected of so ill-advised a measure. One of the Senators who introduced the bill, Senator FRANCIS CASE, Republican of South Dakota, announced that he will not support the bill in its present form. CASE said he hadn't read the bill when he introduced it.

Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat of Virginia, Senate economy leader and one of the financial experts of the Federal Government, termed sections of the bill "pork barrel" legislation.

On the other side of the fence, some of the New Deal Democrats are blasting the proposal because they say it doesn't go far enough. They contend that while the President calls it a \$100 billion Federal program, it actually would provide only \$25 billion during the next 10 years. Only \$25 billion.

The New Dealers can't let the Eisenhower administration get away with bigger promises and bigger give-aways, so they'd like to top his fantasy with a superfantasy.

The divergence of congressional opinion on the Eisenhower program is revealing. It shows how difficult it is, seemingly impossible even, to get Congress back into a frame of mind to live within the Nation's income. In this respect, the American people obviously are far ahead of congressional thinking. Millions who voted for President Eisenhower in 1952 thought they were voting for a balanced budget and an end to reckless spending by the Federal Government. They have not realized their hopes.

The Eisenhower highway proposal is perhaps the greatest deviation from the Republican campaign promises of 1952. Not only because of the enormous amount of money involved; not only because it further centralizes power in Washington and catapults the Federal Government closer to national socialism, but also because it proposes a dangerous new way for financing Federal give-aways, is the highway measure an ill-advised thing. The Federal Government would raise the money through the issuance of bonds of some authority to be set up, thus circumventing the national debt limit.

Obviously, the bill will be warmly debated in the Senate and House. It is to be hoped that one of the bodies will kill it.

[From the Oskaloosa (Iowa) Herald of February 25, 1955]

Senator BYRD and others have already had something to say about this bookkeeping. The proposal is for the Federal Government to borrow some \$25 billion from the public, spend it on roads, but then pretend that it has added not one penny to the Federal debt. It would do this by setting up a highway authority which would do the actual borrowing but whose debts would be guaranteed by the Treasury, just like any other Federal debt.

This would simply be a bit of shenanigans to get around the legal limit on the Government's debt. And if it can be done for highways, then, of course it can be done for other things—schools, hospitals, and the like. This would open the way for a Federal bookkeeping system that would be essentially dishonest, because it would offer the pretense that a debt isn't a debt.

Yet there is more to this program that ought to be looked at than the bookkeeping. For this is not simply a program for increasing Federal assistance to State highway commissions; it would begin to make the planning and paying for the Nation's roads a Federal responsibility.

[From the Hendersonville (N. C.) Times-News of February 26, 1955]

### BOTH POLITICAL PARTIES CHARGED WITH PORK-BARREL TACTICS

Senator HARRY BYRD brands the President's \$101 billion highway program a clever pork-barrel political maneuver. Similar criticism comes from other sources, including the press and some political leaders.

On the other hand, similar charges of engaging in "pork" production are lodged against the Democratic plan for tax reduction. David Lawrence views this plan as "the cheapest form of demagoguery."

Thus, the stage setting seems to be emerging for a couple of violent contests.

The Charlotte Observer views the road plan as a pork-barrel move and says the tax-cut plan is "pure politics." This newspaper approves the road plan if it is confined to what the President called a strategic network. If it extends to secondary and feeder roads and streets, the Observer is against it.

President Eisenhower has already announced that he will ask for tax reduction in 1956, shortly before the next election. Ike opened a big hole in his position by

making that admission; but it seems clear that the Democrats are planning to beat him by way of walking through the breach before 1956.

David Lawrence's summary in a heavy assault on the tax-reduction plan is here quoted:

"The Democratic majority in Congress has apparently decided to constitute itself a 'wrecking crew,' with the obvious purpose of wrecking the Eisenhower administration even if it means wrecking the Nation's economy at the same time.

"The party that promised the electorate in the congressional campaign last autumn that it would uphold the hands of the President and support his measures now has turned on him, and on the country, too, and has embarked upon a course of irresponsibility which cannot be justified even on the ground of partisan benefit. For the new proposal to buy the American voters by giving everybody \$20 off his tax bill and also freeing nearly 5 million voters from paying any taxes at all is the cheapest form of demagogery."

These and many other attacks on the taxing and road construction proposals indicate the extent to which the people have lost confidence in the integrity of party leadership. If the charges are basically sound the indictments are justified; if the proposals are honest suggestions as to national policies, the persons in the Government responsible for them are due credit for honesty of purpose. President Eisenhower and the Republicans, or the Democratic leaders, in these cases, may be wrong; if they are wrong and these plans are adopted and fail, great will be the tragic aspects of these policies.

In that case the people would be the chief sufferers from the mistakes in government.

Highway planning and construction must continue in order to meet the needs of a growing and expanding Nation. This problem can only be ignored at great inconvenience and cost to highway users. The country must try to keep pace with the demands of adequate highway construction and maintenance.

Good business judgment should be applied in this department of national and State spending of public money, as in all other departments. Doubtless all intelligent citizens are agreed at this point—the division of opinion occurs when determination of what is needed, what is financially possible, and what is politically expedient, must be made.

The Republican campaign promises made in the last national contest were summed up in promises to wipe out extravagance and irresponsible management in government and to balance the national budget and stop inflation.

The country is expecting the administration to make good that promise. Newspaper readers who have closely watched the procedure of the administration are justified in doubting that steps being taken will achieve the ends promised.

The same conditions which apply to national highway problems are true of the other large and important business problems which are directly connected with the operations of government.

If the Eisenhower administration spends as much or more cash than the previous "Dealer" administrations expended, how can inflation be stopped and the budget balanced?

Some progress in that direction can be made by eliminating extravagance in Government management and unnecessary spending. Much progress can be made by eliminating politically expedient spending.

To contend that Government expenses cannot be reduced is an assertion which cannot be successfully supported by the facts.

Senator BYRD and other conservative businessmen, including the Hoover Commission, have pointed out in factual order how the Federal budget can be balanced. Balanced—not in a few months, but within reasonable time. This cannot be done, however, by increasing expenditures daily, weekly or annually.

The only way to practice economy is to economize. The only way to balance a budget is to reduce the expense account to a point within the income.

[From the Pottsville (Pa.) Republican of February 24, 1955]

#### ADEQUATE HIGHWAYS WILL COME SOME DAY

President Eisenhower's \$10 billion highway-construction program is being assailed by some United States Senators. Senator BYRD, Virginia Democrat, calls it "pork barrel"—meaning that it is purely for political purposes in the areas where the funds would be spent. Senator GORE, Tennessee Democrat, calls the President's idea to have a portion of Federal gas tax funds earmarked for 30 years for construction of superhighways as irresponsible financing.

Ten billion dollars sounds like a lot of money—and it is. Senator BYRD, for whom we have considerable respect as a watchdog of the Treasury, was probably shocked at mention of the amount. We pour out billions of dollars every year because of the Communist threat. Why can't we spend a few billions on roads which are badly needed in many States? And why should a long-range financing program for adequate highways be termed irresponsible financing?

The motorists of this Nation—and they are increasing in number every year—have long thought that they are not getting a fair return in new roads for the huge amount of money they are paying in local, county, State, and Federal taxes. Much of the motorists' dollar is going into general funds.

If it would become necessary to quickly evacuate big metropolitan areas, it would soon be discovered how inadequate the highways are. There have been instances when a few inches of snow caused traffic jams that virtually tied up a big city for hours. Imagine what a sudden rush of panic-stricken people would do to highways leading out of a large city.

A few Senators can indulge in loose talk about the Eisenhower road program, but it is something that must, of necessity, come some day. The increasing number of automobiles on the streets and highways is causing serious business complications all over the country by the reason of the resulting congestion. Eventually, every community will wake up to the realization that something must be done about it.

[From the Newburyport (Mass.) News, March 2, 1955]

#### THE FEDERAL ROADS PROGRAM

The National Advisory Committee for a National Highway Program, appointed by President Eisenhower, has proposed that the Federal Government spend an additional \$25 billion—over what is now being spent—in the next 10 years for an interstate highway system.

The committee proposes that the extra \$25 billion would result in the construction of 40,000 road miles, or about 800 miles per State. The committee would finance this project by borrowing \$20 billion at 3 percent interest, while collecting \$5 billion in fees from filling stations, motels, and so forth.

However, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia Democrat, has pointed out some of the dangers which such a program might entail. Once again, BYRD has ably presented the other side of the argument concerning a desirable program.

First, BYRD points out that the 10-year program would result in an interstate highway system which would be little more than 1 percent of all public road mileage. Concerning the cost of this, if the 3-percent interest rate was paid on the borrowed \$20 billion, the last bonds maturing in 1987, the interest in this period alone would cost taxpayers another \$11.5 billion.

Senator BYRD offers an alternative program: First, he would repeal the 2-cent tax now being collected by the Federal Government, with the idea that the States would impose it themselves to get revenue for their own road program. Second, he would continue the Federal-aid program as it is today to primary, secondary, and urban road systems, on the long standing matching basis.

Third, he would continue to collect the lubricating oil tax now collected by the Federal Government. And fourth, he would put a one-half cent per gallon Federal tax on gasoline, and the revenue from this tax—plus the lubricating oil tax—would pay the Federal Government's way for the highway-aid program.

We are strongly in favor of the Byrd program and hope that Congress will give it a trial before it sets up a vast Federal road bureaucracy.

[From the Haverhill (Mass.) Gazette of March 1, 1955]

#### FEDERAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM

President Eisenhower presented his highway construction program to Congress without emphasis on the means of financing it. He said merely that he was inclined to favor the financing plan recommended by the President's Committee on a National Highway Program.

The committee's recommendations, as described by Senator BYRD, fall generally into 2 parts: (1) Continuation of the regular Federal aid to highways at the rate of \$623 million a year, and (2) expenditure during the next 10 years of an additional \$25 billion for an interstate highway system. BYRD estimated the Federal expenditures for the 2 programs in 10 years would amount to \$31 billion.

The \$25 billion of Federal expenditures would be financed by the collection of \$5 billion from filling stations, motels, and restaurants operated along the new highways and by selling \$20 billions in 30-year 3-percent taxable bonds.

Legislation to provide for carrying out the committee's recommendations was introduced coincident with the presentation of the President's plan.

Previously another highway construction bill had been introduced by Senator GORE and hearings on it have been started by the Senate Public Works Committee. This bill would authorize Federal appropriations of \$1.6 billion a year for the next 5 years. The States would have to match \$1.1 billion of this amount dollar for dollar. The rest of it they would have to match on a basis of \$1 for every \$2 advanced by Washington. If the States matched the Federal money, the Gore bill would mean an annual expenditure of about \$3 billion a year for 5 years.

BYRD has another plan which has not yet been formally expressed in legislation. He would amend the recommendations of the President's committee to provide:

"1. That the 2-cent gasoline tax now being collected by the Federal Government be repealed, thus permitting the States to reimpose it.

"2. Present Federal aid to primary, secondary, and urban road systems, which for many years has been integrated with State highway systems, be continued on the long-standing match basis. This amounts to \$535 million.



"3. That the lubricating-oil tax now collected by the Federal Government be continued.

"4. A one-half-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax be assessed. Revenue from this tax plus the Federal lubricating-oil tax shortly will be enough to compensate the Federal Treasury for this program."

There is a fundamental difference between the Gore and Byrd plans, on the one hand, and the Eisenhower plan, on the other. Byrd and Gore propose a pay-as-you-go method of financing Federal aid on highway construction. The Eisenhower plan advances what Byrd calls procedures that "violate financing principles, defy budgetary control, and evade Federal debt law." Let us quote Byrd further on the Eisenhower plan:

"The committee recommended to the President that the program be financed through a Federal corporation which, without either assets or income, would borrow \$20 billion from the public. The Treasury, under a contract with the corporation, would guarantee the corporation's bonds, but the debt would not be included in the record of obligations guaranteed by the United States. Annual appropriations to meet principal and interest payments would be requested, but the request could not be refused or reduced by subsequent Congresses, for 30 years, if the faith and credit of the Government are to be honored. If financial difficulty should develop at any time, the corporation with no further authorization could make mandatory calls upon the Treasury for amounts up to \$5 billion outstanding at any one time. \* \* \*

"If the Federal Government can properly borrow money for roads in this fashion, without regarding it as debt, and spend it without budgetary control, it may be expected that similar proposals will be made for financing endless outlays which may be desirable for education, hospitals, public health, etc. \* \* \*

"This would mean operating the Government on two sets of books: One set for activities financed by borrowing outside the debt and expenditures outside budgetary control, and the other set for activities financed by borrowing on the record and expenditures under budget control.

"Count it as you will, as we spend more than our income we add to our debt. The least the Government can do, in fairness to taxpayers, is to keep books and accounts in a manner reflecting the true state of our fiscal affairs. \* \* \*

It is no wonder, we think, that Senator SALTONSTALL's comment on the President's program was:

"We have got to build roads, but I want to know a little more about the method of financing."

The Senator is right. We must build roads and Federal assistance in financing construction is sound, both because of the interstate nature of highways and because of the need to weld the highway system to the requirements of the national defense. But the need is not so urgent that it requires either a departure from sound financial practice or from Eisenhower's devotion to decentralization of Federal authority. In this connection, it is pertinent to note that Byrd's proposals call for greater States responsibility in a highway building program.

[From the Bradford (Pa.) Era of March 3, 1955]

#### HIGHWAYS FOR AMERICA

The President wants this country to build new highways and lots of them. Luckily for him, he is not too dogmatic about how to finance it all.

The plan he sent to Congress this week calls for spending \$101 billion over the next 10 years on highways. Almost a third of the money would be put up by Uncle Sam; the rest by the States. One feature of the

financing has drawn heavy fire. This calls for a Federal authority that would issue about \$25 billion worth of bonds. These would be paid off out of gas taxes, tolls, and the like.

The authority idea would nicely circumvent the budget. Uncle Sam would be in the hole for \$25 billion but that fact would not show up in the regular debt. We in Pennsylvania are very familiar with the trick.

A lot of Senators, including the powerful HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, are opposed to an authority. They say that money spent ought to show up clearly in the budget as just that.

If the Government did take the authority drug in this instance, it might find the habit irresistible. Soon we might have Federal authorities to finance schools, hospitals, civilian defense, and what-have-you. Then it would be almost impossible for the citizen to know what the budget meant and what was the true state of the national debt.

Whatever the disagreement on financing, however, few can disagree on the need for an all-out highway program. Our roads are far below the needs of this most motorized nation in the world. They are falling further below every day.

Our economy is growing. Commerce, safety, and defense require that our highways keep pace with this growth. That is really the heart of the highway matter before Congress.—Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

[From the Fayetteville (N. C.) Observer, February 26, 1955]

#### IKE'S ROAD PLAN: IS IT NECESSARY IN ATOM AGE?

Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia, the Nation's foremost apostle of economy, has branded President Eisenhower's \$101 billion road-construction program as a "pork-barrel" scheme. His views concerning this proposed measure are reminiscent of his attitude toward some of President Roosevelt's pump-priming legislation back in the 1930's.

Mr. Eisenhower, however, uses the atomic age rather than pump-priming, as an argument for his road program. He points out that the Nation must possess an excellent system of roads for use in evacuations in event of atomic attacks.

There is some question of just how much value a system of super highways would be in event an A-bomb or an H-bomb splattered upon them. One theory is that the best defense against atomic attack this country can devise is a mighty buildup of weapons for retaliation.

The President's road-building program would cover a 10-year period and about a third of the cost would be borne by the Federal Government with the State and local governments paying the balance. It must be noted that North Carolina now is considering a \$97 million primary road program for the next 2 years. Additional appropriations, which would be necessary under the Eisenhower program, would create new and more perplexing taxation problems.

It must be admitted, however, that an adequate national highway system must be maintained if the Nation is to be in readiness for war, whether that war be atomic or otherwise, since the Nation cannot gird itself for defense without a workable system of land communication.

Main question raised by the Eisenhower proposal is whether it is too ambitious, especially since the Government is operating in the red despite monumental taxation.

A compromise would seem appropriate as to the \$101 billion highway proposal. From a political standpoint, it will be interesting to note how those anti-Eisenhower political elements, which have been pressing for more "made work" governmental projects, will view the proposition. If they oppose the President on this, their position is likely to be rather inconsistent.

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) World of February 23, 1955]

#### STRUGGLE OVER ROAD BILLS

Congress is wrestling mightily over the Eisenhower highway program. Formal dissent to the administration measure, listed as a \$101 billion affair, is found in the Gore bill, which differs materially in the matter of State-Federal partnership in road-building.

That the President's bill, as drawn up by Gen. Lucius Clay and others, is in for a rough time is putting it mildly. The objections piled up fast, even before the measure was sent to Congress. The most bitter fight will probably be upon financing. The official bill has been itemized this way:

Interstate network, joining 50 percent of all cities over 50,000 population, \$23 billion; primary system, connecting all principal cities and manufacturing areas, \$30 billion; secondary system, including farm-to-market roads, \$15 billion; other streets and roads, including urban feeder streets, \$33 billion. The proposal covers 10 years of activity. The Federal Government would put up \$25 billion for the interstate system and proportionate amounts for the other items.

To finance this program, there is proposed a 30-year bond issue, to be paid off by gasoline and diesel taxes and taxes upon motels along the right-of-way. To this plan, the influential Senator HARRY BYRD has made stiff objections; it would dry up gasoline as a source of general revenue. These taxes, according to a late statement from the White House, would be earmarked for debt retirement. The aggregated interest, according to Senator BYRD, would be \$11,500,000,000. The Byrd proposal is to cut the Federal gasoline tax from 2 mills to one-half mill and leave much of the road program to the States; they would be enabled to use their own gasoline taxes to a great extent and thus cut down the Federal expenditures.

The measure will be fired upon from many angles. Western Congressmen are not quite happy over it; they say it refers to thick populations rather than distances. The official bill provides for continuation of the matching program between States and the Nation.

There is, however, one general agreement: We must have more and better highways. The big fight has some undoubted political phases, but the struggle is not over the desirability of a big program but upon financing it and preserving the balance between the State and Federal Governments and dealing equitably with diverse areas.

[From the Grants Pass (Oreg.) Courier of February 21, 1955]

#### A DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

Everyone realizes that the huge number of motor vehicles being operated daily by the people of the United States calls for huge outlays of funds with which to provide more and better highways.

Thus one may sympathize with the objection of the President's \$101 billion Federal highway program.

However, the President's proposal contains a provision which sets up a precedent which is so dangerous that we believe the method should not be used under any circumstances.

We refer to the proposal to set up a Government-owned corporation, without assets, which would be authorized to borrow \$20 billion, this debt not to be included in the national debt, but still a financial obligation of the Government.

This method of increasing the national indebtedness without running afoul of the statutory debt limitation was worked out by the President's highway commission, headed by Gen. Lucius Clay.

Probably there is no greater authority on tax matters in the United States today than Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia.

BYRD is a Democrat but he fought Truman spending policies year after year. Today, he is doing what he can to warn the Nation of the danger in the President's road program.

Here is a statement from Senator BYRD on the subject:

"Actually the committee recommends that the Federal Government assume virtually the complete obligation for the so-called interstate highway system (abolishing the 60-40 Federal-State matching requirement in this program) and that it be financed by methods which are unique so far as I know, and thoroughly unsound.

"The committee recommended to the President that the program be financed through a Federal corporation which, without either assets or income, would borrow \$20 billion from the public. The Treasury, under a contract with the corporation, would guarantee the corporation's bonds, but the debt would not be included in the record of obligations guaranteed by the United States. Annual appropriations to meet principal and interest payments would be requested, but the request could not be refused or reduced by subsequent Congresses, for 30 years, if the faith and credit of the Government are to be honored. If financial difficulty should develop at any time, the corporation, with no further authorization could make mandatory calls upon the Treasury for amounts up to \$5 billion outstanding at any one time.

"Such procedures violate financing principles, defy budgetary control, and evade Federal debt law.

"If the Federal Government can properly borrow money for roads in this fashion, without regarding it as debt, and spend it without budgetary control, it may be expected that similar proposals will be made for financing endless outlays which may be desirable for education, hospitals, public health, etc. In fact I am informed that such a plan is now under consideration for school construction.

"This would mean operating the Government on two sets of books: One set for activities financed by borrowing outside the debt and expenditures outside budgetary control, and the other set for activities financed by borrowing on the record and expenditures under budget control.

"Count it as you will, as we spend more than our income we add to our debt. The least the Government can do, in fairness to taxpayers, is to keep books and accounts in a manner reflecting the true state of our fiscal affairs.

"When the Government contracts a bona fide debt, but arbitrarily removes it from classification as public indebtedness, it creates fiscal confusion and disorder, and destroys confidence in Government credit.

"You cannot avoid financial responsibility by legerdemain, and you cannot evade debt by definition. The obligations of the Federal Government and all its citizens will still remain."

We agree with BYRD's position that adoption of the President's program would do away with any national debt control and, ultimately, lead to highly dangerous inflation.

[From the Newark (N. J.) News of February 24, 1955]

#### FINANCING ROAD PROGRAM

President Eisenhower has presented compelling argument in support of his national roadbuilding program. Few question the necessity of improving and expanding our highway system.

Opposition centers chiefly on tentative proposals for financing the Federal Government's share of the \$101 billion project. Though he leans to the idea of a bond issue, the President has not taken a hard and fast position but apparently is ready to consider any reasonable plan.

Senator BYRD has served as a useful watchdog over Federal finances, but he goes too far when he puts the pork-barrel label on the President's program on the ground that it would reimburse States like New Jersey for some of the funds they have already invested in superhighways.

He overlooks the fact that these States have not yet completed road programs that are highly important to interstate, even transcontinental, commerce.

There is plenty of room for discussion of the financing. State interests have suggested in the past that the gasoline tax be a source of revenue left wholly to the States, which will have to provide the greatest share of the funds invested in this roadbuilding effort.

This would argue for tolls, rather than gas taxes, to liquidate the debt. Tolls are working out very well in the large turnpike projects already completed and might be less objectionable politically.

[From the Lynchburg (Va.) News of February 16, 1955]

#### IKE'S WAY OUT

It is becoming more and more evident that the administration acted without thinking through when it plunked for that multi-billion-dollar Federal highway-construction program on which the Clay Commission recently reported, and, which, it is announced, will go to the Congress next week.

First was the mistake of underestimating the strength of the opposition to the plan itself, both in theory and in practice. It has been denounced as unsound governmental philosophy and as a fiscal crime. Opposition has been vocally vigorous and weighty in argument. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, as chairman of the powerful Senate Finance Committee, is the most influential opponent, but he is not alone. The program faces what appears to be an almost insuperable barrier. It is hardly probable that the administration had anticipated running into anything like it.

Now, we are informed by Roscoe Drummond, writing on this page today, that the delay in presenting the program to the Congress has been due to the second mistake the administration made in this matter. It endorsed the program without first deciding upon the method of financing the program, whether to pay out that huge sum annually from taxes or whether to issue bonds to mature under the Clay plan, in 30 years. Opposition to the bond issue feature is not confined to those who oppose the whole program from principle. The fiscally sound are, as Drummond described Senator BYRD's state of mind, horrified at its unsoundness. Why not, then, abandon that proposal and turn to a pay-as-you-go plan? The answer is simple: To do that would mean to forfeit all hope of reducing the national debt, of balancing the budget and reducing taxes next year or for years to come, even if sweet peace descends to envelop the world. It is a poor choice that is presented, and it still is not announced which the President has made or will make.

There is, of course, a way out. A few days ago in response to a question as to why he had changed his mind radically about the advisability of a decision he had made previously, President Eisenhower remarked simply that he had discovered that he had made an error and naturally moved to correct it. He has made two errors with his highway-construction program, a program that is out of line with the Federal Union which this Government was intended to be and which by the terms of the compact, known as the Constitution, it is, a program that cannot be financed by any method with any pretensions to soundness. His way out is to admit the mistake, pigeonhole the Clay report, and forget all about the thing. There

are so many important questions to give him headaches that he would be wise to get rid of this one while he can. And while about it he might take a quick look at his school-construction program with its bribe to localities to go head over heels into debt. We say a quick look because that ought to be sufficient to lead him to discard this migraine provocative, too.

#### AIR FORCE POLICY OF PROCUREMENT DISPERSAL

MR. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last February, before a House of Representatives Subcommittee on Appropriations, the Secretary of the Air Force, Hon. Harold E. Talbott, made some comments with respect to the policy of dispersal in the overall policy of aircraft procurement.

Mr. President, I think you are undoubtedly acquainted with the fact that a great segment of the economy of southern California is geared to aircraft production for the United States Air Force. By reason of the comments which the Secretary made, there was considerable concern and no little apprehension among the people connected with the industry and generally throughout the State of California regarding the status of the industry, and, indeed, doubt of what the policy of dispersal meant. That apprehension was shared in Washington by my colleague the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], by the members of the House delegation from California, and by myself.

My colleague and I prepared a letter, addressed to the Secretary of the Air Force, in which we asked, as carefully as we could, a number of pertinent questions, and we requested the Secretary of the Air Force to give us answers to those questions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of the letter which my colleague and I sent to the Secretary of the Air Force, and a copy of the letter which the Secretary made to us by way of reply.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
May 11, 1955.

HON. HAROLD E. TALBOTT,  
Secretary of the Air Force,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In view of the apprehension which has developed in our State—particularly in southern California—following testimony you and General Twining gave in the House Appropriations Subcommittee recently, concerning the Air Force policy of procurement dispersal we appreciated the opportunity to confer with you.

Management, labor and local government officials in California have voiced serious concern as to what may be intended. We wish, therefore, to ask several specific questions relative to the Air Force procurement policy as it affects the relationship of the Air Force with contractors on the west coast and we shall appreciate very much an answer from you to each of the following questions:

1. What is the dispersal policy of the Air Force in connection with procurement?
2. Is it the same as for the Army and Navy?



3. How long has the present policy been in existence?

4. What, if any, is the difference in your policy from that announced in 1947 by the President's Commission on Aviation Policy?

5. Within congressional limitations of appropriations, your obligational authority, and the requirements of national defense, will Air Force dispersal policy permit the continued placing of contracts with California manufacturers? As far as can be foreseen, will Air Force purchases under your dispersal policy result in maintenance of employment at approximately present levels?

6. Does the dispersal policy preclude increasing the employment level in southern California aircraft plants engaged in military production under the present contracts?

7. Is it contemplated that reorders of aircraft currently being produced in southern California will be awarded present contractors on a basis that will assure continued operations at southern California plants presently working on Air Force contracts?

8. Since there are tremendous numbers of small concerns in California engaged in subcontracting and supplying prime contractors, will the Air Force desire for dispersal affect their participation in future procurement?

9. Is the policy of dispersal limited to bringing about erection of any required new production facilities in other locations of the United States? Or, will the policy lead to curtailment of production by existing west coast contractors and the transfer of present production to other areas of the country?

The phenomenal population and production growth of California in the past decade shows no signs of tapering off. As we are sure you appreciate, a substantial degree of the economy of the southern California area is directly related to military aircraft manufacture and Air Force procurement policy. The people of southern California, both workers and management, have set astounding records for efficient performance both in war and in peace. In justice to this great industry, and to the communities in which it is situated, we earnestly feel that the matter of Air Force procurement policy as it involves dispersal of producing facilities should be clarified.

Very sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,  
THOMAS H. KUCHEL.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,  
Washington, May 16, 1955.

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: This will reply to your letter of May 11, in which you ask several specific questions relative to the Air Force procurement policy as it affects the relationship of the Air Force with contractors on the west coast.

I am pleased with the opportunity this provides to discuss with you this very vital national military problem. The answers to your questions are as follows:

1. What is the dispersal policy of the Air Force in connection with procurement?

Answer: Basically, our policy with respect to dispersal is to place our orders in such a way that we will avoid increasing the heavy concentrations of key defense industries in single locations. Our best method of bringing about dispersal is to make certain that the new organizations and new facilities which the Government must finance directly or indirectly are steered away from areas of concentration. Our real concern is the tendency of these concentrations to increase.

2. Is it the same as for the Army and Navy?

Answer: This policy is the same for the Army, the Navy and the Marine Corps. It is

also a defense policy and an Office of Defense Mobilization policy.

3. How long has the present policy been in existence?

Answer: This general policy has been in existence since the start of heavy aircraft expenditures during World War II.

4. What, if any, is the difference in your policy from that announced in 1947 by the President's Commission on Aviation Policy?

Answer: This policy is the same as that announced in 1947 by the President's Commission on Aviation Policy—the Finletter Committee. The following quotation from this report deals with this policy:

"At the end of World War II, the aircraft and aircraft engine plants were well dispersed, as shown on the map elsewhere in this section. A large part of our total production of military aircraft is now concentrated in the Los Angeles area, on Long Island, and at Seattle.

"It is regrettable that the wartime-plant dispersion was not maintained. Our reserve plants (i. e., Government-owned plants not now in operation) are still well dispersed. If, in response to a mobilization order, reserve plants are brought into production, the total aircraft manufacturing plant pattern would represent an effective geographical dispersal. If, on the other hand, an attack should precede activation of the reserve plants, the industry will offer highly concentrated targets. We recommend that, in future plant expansion, the services avoid further concentration in these areas as far as possible."

5. Within congressional limitations of appropriations your obligational authority, and the requirements of national defense, will Air Force dispersal policy permit the continued placing of contracts with California manufacturers? As far as can be foreseen, will Air Force purchases under your dispersal policy result in maintenance of employment at approximately present levels?

Answer: The Air Force will definitely continue to place large contracts with California manufacturers. It is here that we have many of our most important engineering organizations and production facilities, and we definitely plan to use them. Procurement of military equipment of the highest quality in the shortest time and at the lowest cost is our primary objective, and to attain it we must use existing facilities and know-how to the fullest extent possible.

This will not necessarily result in maintenance of employment at approximately present levels. However, as our total requirements for aircraft and other equipment go up or down, as they have in the past, we would expect that part manufactured in California would go up or down also. Actually, as we complete the aircraft for the 137-wing Air Force, we expect that there will be a general decrease in aircraft production, and that there will be some decrease in employment in California. This is not the result of the dispersal policy, however.

6. Does the dispersal policy preclude increasing the employment level in southern California aircraft plants engaged in military production under the present contracts?

Answer: The dispersal policy does not preclude increasing the employment level in southern California aircraft plants engaged in military production under present contracts. However, the most important factor to bear in mind is the fact that as certain models are completed and other models started, that employment will go up in some plants and down in others.

7. Is it contemplated that reorders of aircraft currently being produced in southern California will be awarded present contractors on a basis that will assure continued operations at southern California plants presently working on Air Force contracts?

Answer: We are continually reordering aircraft from southern California plants and expect to continue to do so. In addition, we expect to place orders for new designs with these firms in cases where the work can be done with existing facilities.

8. Since there are tremendous numbers of small concerns in California engaged in subcontracting and supplying prime contractors, will the Air Force desire for dispersal affect their participation in future procurement?

Answer: Generally speaking we are not as concerned about the concentration of small suppliers as we are about the larger companies since the type of work they perform is generally already broadly dispersed. Most of this work is placed by the prime manufacturers who like to have at least two sources of supply in different locations, and we are not as worried as we are in the case of the manufacturers of our major items where it is too costly to establish multiple sources except in special cases. We would not, however, give Government support to the creation of a new organization or the establishment of new facilities if we thought there was an undesirable tendency to concentrate a critical item in a given area.

9. Is the policy of dispersal limited to bringing about erection of any required new production facilities in other locations of the United States? Or, will the policy lead to curtailment of production by existing west coast contractors and the transfer of present production to other areas of the country?

Answer: We have no intention of curtailing production by existing west coast contractors by the transfer of present production to other areas of the country. It is, however, definitely our intention to implement this policy by controlling the location of new facilities.

I hope that the answers to these questions will permit you and your constituents to better understand the dispersal policy of the Air Force and the Defense Department.

Sincerely,

HAROLD E. TALBOTT.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to say that my colleague and the House of Representatives delegation from California and I do not propose to see any policy of dispersal upon the part of the Military Establishment applied in such a way as to do an injustice to our State or to any other part of the country.

The answers which were given by the Secretary of the Air Force ally, I think, to an extent, much of the apprehension which has arisen in California. However, we propose to pursue the matter further.

#### MINING CLAIMS AND FISHING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, sportsmen and other conservationists are greatly concerned over some of the legislation pending before the Congress involving changes in policies toward use of our public lands.

One of the serious questions arising has been abuse of the mining claim privilege of "weekend miners" to place out of bounds to the public, thousands of acres of choice fishing streams, timber stands, home sites, scenic camping grounds, and lake frontages.

I regret that the House of Representatives has passed a bill to throw the door open even wider to these spurious "prospectors."

However, I note that all conservationists are pleased that a new amendment to the mining law is being considered by

both the House and Senate to correct many of the abuses resulting from the old law of 1872, and at the same time protect legitimate mining.

No one is opposing bonafide mining claims; all sportsmen ask is that we recognize the facts that exist about spurious mining claims.

I want to commend the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for introducing S. 1713 to accomplish this purpose of protecting future fishing on our western public lands, and urge its support. Hearings are now in progress.

I have had the privilege of reading an advance copy of an article on this subject to appear in the June issue of the Sport Fishing Institute Bulletin. Because it is a sound explanation of the issue, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "Mining Claims and Fishing," be printed in the body of the RECORD. I commend it to my colleagues for consideration.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### MINING CLAIMS AND FISHING

The public lands in our 12 Western States furnish some of America's finest fishing. Of our 30 million anglers, most of those who have never had a try at catching wild fish in these highly scenic surroundings are undoubtedly looking forward to the day when they can have this pleasant and exciting experience.

If you are one of the many anglers bent on realizing this long-time ambition, you might be in for a rude awakening when you reach your destination. In one of the national forests, or on some of the extensive tracts managed by the United States Bureau of Land Management, you should have no trouble in finding just the sort of stream you have dreamed about—a clear, unpolluted mountain stream, well supplied with wild trout. But, you might also find something else. Stretched across the trail may be a barbed-wire fence or a locked gate, or there may simply be a conspicuous sign, telling you to keep out.

It's quite possible that someone may have staked out a mining claim on 20 acres of land. This would cost him \$1.25. By staking this claim across the canyon, the person who owns the claim can keep you out of many miles of stream simply by making access to the water above the claim virtually impossible.

Someone may keep you from fishing on a stream flowing through land which belongs to all of us, simply by forking over \$1.25. He can have his own private fishing stream, at your expense.

All this can happen because of a mining law adopted 83 years ago.

Actually, all a person has to do to stake a claim is to mark off the four corners of a 20-acre tract and record it in the county office. Any number of claims may be located so long as the mineral deposits discovered are sufficient to justify development by a prudent man. Along with the more valuable minerals, deposits of all the common varieties of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, and pumicite may be the basis for claims locations.

In all too many cases the claimants are "weekend miners" and under their spurious operations thousands of acres of choice fishing streams, timber stands, homesites, scenic camping grounds, and lake frontages have been placed out of bounds to the public.

As of January 1952, there were 36,000 mining patents on the national forests involving 918,000 acres of land. Although these

had gone to patent under the mining laws, only 15 percent are commercially successful mines.

According to reports, there are 84,000 mining claims on these same forests involving 2,100,000 acres, with only 2 percent producing minerals in commercial quantities. Probably no more than 40 percent would be valid even under the weak provisions of the law. What's more, the timber tied up on these lands is worth more than \$100 million and would build about 800,000 5-room houses. Since there is no time limit for claims to be brought to patent, the land is tied up indefinitely.

All rights to the surface uses go with the claims. The claimant has the trump card. Access to nearby lands and waters may be cut off, fishing prohibited along previously open streams, lake frontages, picnic and campsites taken over, timber products and grazing rights usurped.

These statutes tie the hands of the Federal land administering agencies. It would cost about \$20 million to examine existing claims and protest those that are invalid. Three thousand man-years of work would be required. More than 16,000 claims are filed each year, and nothing would prevent the claimant from refiled once his application for patent is rejected.

Back in 1872, when the present law was passed, there were only a few people in the West to stake out claims. There were few users of our public lands. The law at that time was a good one.

But conditions have changed. Thousands of people have filed spurious claims to get a chunk of public land, and the waters and timber on it, for their own exclusive use. Now the uranium prospecting craze is really pointing out the need for a change in the law.

Fortunately, some of the streams have been withdrawn or reserved for possible power development. But even these may be opened to the undesirable practices which exist elsewhere. The House of Representatives has passed a bill (H. R. 100) which would throw these remaining lands open to the "prospectors." Several times in the past the House has passed such a bill, but each time it has died in the Senate.

Fortunately, a new amendment to the mining law is being considered by both House and Senate. It's a bill which would correct many of the abuses resulting from the law of 1872. At the same time, it would protect legitimate mining. Incidentally, some of these public lands support extensive mining. We object to the abuses—not to mining.

Our objection is to the spurious mining claims, not to the bona fide ones.

Under these proposed amendments, access to, and use of, fishing streams covered by unpatented claims appears to be assured.

The new bill in the House was introduced independently by several Representatives. The first was H. R. 5561, by Congressman WILLIAM A. DAWSON, of Utah. In the Senate the bill is S. 1713, introduced by Senator Anderson in behalf of himself and several other Senators. What happens to this introduced bill may have a very decided effect on future fishing on our western public lands.

#### POSTAL FIELD SERVICE COMPENSATION ACT OF 1945—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 44)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a veto message from the President of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I may say, for the information of the Senate, I have consulted with the able minority leader. He has consulted with the ranking minority member of the

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I have consulted with the able chairman of that committee. On behalf of myself and the minority leader, I ask that the reading of the message be deferred until a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, which is now at the desk, can be read and acted on.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The Chief Clerk read the proposed unanimous consent agreement, as follows:

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That on Tuesday, May 24, 1955, at the conclusion of the routine morning business, the Senate shall proceed to the reconsideration of the bill S. 1, the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, returned by the President of the United States to the Senate without his approval, and that on the question—"Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?"—and all motions, if any be made, relating thereto, debate shall be limited to 3 hours, to be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the said bill and controlled, respectively, by the majority leader and the minority leader (May 19, 1955.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Secretary will now read the message from the President of the United States.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### To the United States Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 1, to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department. I take this action for three reasons. First, the bill creates new discriminations or inequities which would affect many thousands of postal employees. Second, the bill creates grave administrative problems such as the establishment of thousands of individual pay rates. It forces awkward and unfair administrative practices in a Government department whose operations affect every person, every enterprise, every community in the country. Third, the bill imposes a heavier burden upon the taxpayer than is necessary to establish salary rates throughout the Department which will compare favorably with rates for similar work elsewhere in Government and in private industry.

At the outset of this administration, the Postmaster General began a comprehensive study of the entire postal system.

The principal purpose was to discover effective ways and means by which the American people could be assured more speedy, certain, economical, and efficient handling of their mail. Obviously, this purpose can be achieved only if, first, postal employees are dedicated and satisfied in career service because of fair compensation, good working conditions, adequate benefits in vacations, insurance, sick leave, and old-age security; and second, the Department's administrative structure, incorporating the best management practices, is so designed



that merit and responsibility are recognized and rewarded.

In accordance with the findings of the comprehensive study, on January 11, 1955, by special message to the Congress, I recommended an increase in the salaries of postal employees which would be composed of two elements—a general increase in postal pay and a reclassification of postal positions that would eliminate inequities. To accomplish these purposes I recommended a 5-percent pay raise and adjustments in classification to bring about proper wage relationships among the various jobs in postal service. The cost of the reclassification proposals would have brought the total increase to 6½ percent, with an aggregate annual cost of \$129 million.

Those recommendations, if adopted, would have placed the salaries of postal employees in proper relationship to the salaries paid for similar work in nearly all the larger cities. The pay raises recommended were substantially greater than the increase in the cost of living since the last adjustment in postal wages.

Subsequently, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, by a substantial bipartisan majority, reported a bill—H. R. 4644—which, although approximately \$30 million a year more costly than my recommendations, embodied the essential elements of a reclassification system. In the matter of reclassification, that bill, as reported by the committee, could have been, and still can be, with certain corrections, the basis for legislation which would establish fair relationships between the salaries of various positions in the postal service on the sound principle of equal pay for equal work and more pay for more difficult and responsible work.

It has always been recognized that in the consideration of pay legislation, there can be a reasonable difference of opinion as to what constitutes an appropriate increase. But there can be no compromise with the principle of fairness, and any pay legislation must be fair to all to whom it applies. It must be workable administratively and not be excessive in cost.

The bill before me fails to meet these criteria. Specifically:

First. It discriminates against large groups of postal employees such as rural letter carriers, special-delivery messengers, and many supervisors and postmasters. These total tens of thousands.

Second. Aside from creating new and serious administrative problems, the total cost of the bill, approximately \$180 million a year, is substantially greater than is necessary to adjust postal salaries to a fair level, either from the standpoint of pay for comparable work or from the standpoint of increase in the cost of living.

I regret the necessity of the action which I am taking. It is my earnest hope and recommendation that the Congress will quickly consider and enact postal pay legislation that will be in the public interest and fair to all of the half million employees who man the postal service. To meet this test, such legislation should provide a reasonable increase in pay for all postal field-service employees. It

should provide for reclassification of postal positions to bring about proper wage relationships so as to eliminate inequities. It should not discriminate against some groups in favor of others, and it should be administratively workable.

Because the enactment of such legislation will substantially increase the postal deficit, I wish again to emphasize the imperative need for postal rates that will make the postal service self-supporting and be based on service rendered to the user. We can no longer afford to continue a costly deficit operation paid for by millions of taxpayers in amounts out of all proportion to the postal services that they as individuals receive.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 19, 1955.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The message, with the accompanying bill, will be printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the veto by the President of S. 1, a bill providing an 8.6-percent increase in the salaries of the postal employees, is shameful.

This action indicates to me that President Eisenhower is more concerned with soothing the easily ruffled feelings and bruised pride of Postmaster General Summerfield than he is in the economic problems of our postal employees.

It is shameful that these employees should be denied for a second time by Presidential action a pay raise which they justly deserve. First, they were denied an increase in pay last August because the President wanted Congress to increase the price of postage stamps. Now it seems to be denied because the President feels that Congress increased their pay per week by an amount equal to the cost of a bottle of milk above the amount the President's arrogant and unyielding Postmaster General would agree to.

The charge that the conference committee agreement created a number of new inequities should be dismissed as pure hokum. The Senate has been skeptical all along of the position classification plan proposed by the Post Office Department, for the reason that it provided increases of up to 58 percent to the higher-paid employee, as contrasted with increases of only 5 or 6 percent to the rank-and-file employee. In spite of this skepticism, the Senate reluctantly adopted, with some changes, the administration's classification plan, in the hope that such a compromise would result in an immediate pay increase for the postal employee. Apparently a military dictatorship does not recognize compromise, or the prerogative of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, we can only conclude that President Eisenhower and his Cabinet of millionaires do not embrace the workingman with the same warmth of feeling that they do the Dixons and the Yates.

I fail to understand how the President can justify his position of requesting billions and billions of additional dollars to squander abroad, while, at the

same time, denying a decent wage to our own employees here at home.

Let me assure the good postal employees of the Nation that our fight in their behalf will continue.

Mr. CARLSON subsequently said: Mr. President, this afternoon the Senate received the veto message from the President on Senate bill 1, the postal pay bill. The President used his constitutional privilege and prerogative in connection with that measure. The leadership has set next Tuesday as the time when the veto message will be taken up and considered by the Senate. I wish to make the statement that if the President's veto shall be sustained by the Senate, I shall have ready for introduction a bill providing for a 7.6 percent increase in pay. It is my hope that if the veto shall be sustained the Senate will give early consideration to the measure I shall introduce, in order that the postal workers may have the benefit of an increase in pay.

Second, Mr. President, if such a bill is passed by the Senate, I am in position to introduce a bill providing for an increase of 6 percent for the classified workers.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as Senators are aware, it is planned to consider today Senate bill 153, proposing amendment of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. We hope an early vote may be reached on that bill.

I desire to make an announcement, so the Senate will be upon notice, that conferences have been held with regard to other bills on the calendar, and the minority leader has gone over them and approved them for consideration by the Senate. I should like to have Senators who are interested in the proposed legislation know of the possibility that these bills will be brought before the Senate at any time which may be convenient.

First, Calendar No. 352, Senate bill 1580, to regulate subsistence expenses and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government. The bill was introduced by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Next, Calendar No. 354, Senate bill 1048, the so-called roads bill. We plan to make it the unfinished business tomorrow; to have no votes taken on it tomorrow; and to debate the bill on Monday. I doubt that there will be any votes on the bill on Monday.

On Tuesday, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement which has been entered into, following the morning hour, we shall have 3 hours of debate—with one and one-half hours to each side—on the President's veto message of the postal pay bill. I assume that at some time between 3:15 and 4:15 p. m. on that day we are likely to have the yea and nay vote on the question of passing the bill, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding. Then we shall resume consideration of the roads bill, and shall take as much time as may be necessary to obtain action.

We wish to give notice, next, regarding Calendar No. 355, House bill 3322, which relates to the utilization of surplus property for education and public health purposes. That bill was reported from the Committee on Government Operations by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

Next, Calendar No. 356, Senate bill 1805, providing for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government. The bill was also reported from the Committee on Government Operations by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

Next, Calendar No. 357, Senate bill 1795, providing an increased allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, under the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended. The bill was reported from the Committee on Government Operations by the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Next, Calendar No. 358, Senate Resolution 102, conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the George D. Emery Co. That resolution was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

Next, Calendar 359, Senate bill 4052, continuing in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941. That bill was also reported from the Committee on the Judiciary by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

Next, Calendar No. 360, Senate bill 33, relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation. The bill was reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs by the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

Next, Calendar No. 362, Senate Joint Resolution 67, authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines, to provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Philippines. The bill was reported by the able chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. President, it is my understanding that most of the measures I have enumerated will not require any great amount of time. There will be an explanation of each of them, and there will be some discussion of them; but I understand there is no great controversy about any of them.

In the case of every measure I have listed, I have consulted the minority leader. I have asked the staff to notify the Senators who are interested in the measures referred to, and when time permits, we wish to have the Senate proceed to their consideration. I should like all Senators to be aware of the contemplated program.

#### AMENDMENT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT OF 1936

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 153) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] as a substitute for the bill, as amended.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is now present in the Chamber. During the period when the Senate was in recess I was informed that an agreement had been reached in connection with the amendment offered by him a few days ago. I should like to have the junior Senator from Minnesota make a statement for the RECORD. In the meantime, we shall notify other Senators. It is somewhat difficult to get all Senators who are for or against an amendment and Senators who agree on an amendment in the Chamber at the same time. If the Senator from Minnesota will make a statement about what has happened, and what the amendment as modified now provides, perhaps my colleagues can reach other Senators who are interested. I want the Senator from Minnesota to give the Senate assurances with respect to certain conversations he has had with other Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like at this time to read for the purpose of the RECORD and for general discussion and understanding a letter which I have received this morning from Mr. Earl L. Butz, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, dated May 19. This letter follows a conversation which I had last evening with the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, Mr. Anchor Nelsen, in which Mr. Nelsen agreed to support the amendment which has been offered, with a certain clarifying modification.

The proposed modification of the amendment does not change the substance of the amendment which I offered on Tuesday. It merely clarifies the language and transposes certain language to a more appropriate place within the amendment. I shall send to the desk the amendment which I should like to have made the pending question, to replace the amendment previously offered by me, designated "5-17-55-A." I repeat that the modification or clarification does not in any sense change the substance of the amendment which I offered on Tuesday, but merely realines the language and makes it much more clear and understandable.

I now withdraw the pending amendment and offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment previously offered by the Senator from Minnesota is withdrawn. The amendment now offered will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That subsections (c), (d), and (e) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 903 (c), (d), and (e)) are amended to read as follows:

"(c) Twenty-five percent of the annual sums herein made available or appropriated for loans for rural electrification pursuant to sections 4 and 5 of this title shall be allotted yearly by the Administrator for loans in the several States in the proportion which the number of their farms not then receiving central station electric service bears to the total number of farms of the United States not then receiving such service: *Provided*, That if any part of such sums are not loaned or obligated during the first 6 months of the fiscal year for which they are made available, such part shall thereafter be available for loans by the Administrator without allotment: *Provided, however*, That not more than 25 percent of said sums may be employed in any one State or in all of the Territories.

"The Administrator shall within 90 days after the beginning of each fiscal year determine for each State and for the United States the number of farms not then receiving such service.

"(d) The remaining 75 percent of such annual sums shall be available for rural electrification loans in the several States and in the Territories, without allotment as hereinabove provided in such amounts for each State and Territory as, in the opinion of the Administrator, may be effectively employed for the purposes of this act, and to carry out the provisions of section 7: *Provided, however*, That not more than 25 percent of said unallotted annual sums may be employed in any one State, or in all of the Territories.

"(e) If any part of the annual sums made available for the purposes of this act are not loaned or obligated during the fiscal year for which they are made available, such unexpended or unobligated sums shall be available for loans by the Administrator in the following year or years without allotment: *Provided, however*, That not more than 25 percent of said sums for rural electrification loans may be employed in any one State or in all of the Territories."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of such act is amended by striking out "10 percent" and inserting "25 percent."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduced S. 153 because it was recognized that there was no need for earmarking funds. The only question now is with reference to areas or communities where there is need for rural electrification and for REA associations; and once a community can justify its ability to pay back, the funds are always made available. There is no question today about whether funds should be earmarked.

I discussed the amendment offered by my colleague with the Director of REA, Anchor Nelsen, last evening, and today I received a letter from Mr. Earl L. Butz, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, dated May 19.

I understand an identical letter was received by my junior colleague. I was



informed that both of us received the same letter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. The Rural Electrification Administration does not materially object to the amendment. It feels it would be far better than the restrictions imposed on REA in the present administrative act. Therefore, in order that we may obtain action on the question without lengthy debate, I am willing to accept the amendment.

Every one of us has uppermost in his mind the welfare of REA. All of us are trying to make it function 100 percent in every State and in every community. If there is a fear on the part of some that certain communities may be placed in jeopardy because of lack of funds, and if that fear is allayed by the proposed amendment, I have no objection to the adoption of the amendment, and as the author of S. 153 I accept the amendment. I have discussed it with the cosponsors of the bill, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. I know that REA will be improved by the adoption of this amendment. I am sure that at some future time that all restrictions on REA funds will be removed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank my colleague. I join with him in saying that the whole purpose of the amendment and of the bill introduced by my senior colleague is to improve and to strengthen rural electrification. It is the feeling of the junior Senator from Minnesota that the pending amendment upon which the Senate will shortly vote, will meet the requirements of the rural electrification program.

As the senior Senator from Minnesota has stated his desire, it is my hope also that at a later date, when the States which have not progressed as far as other States have with their initial REA development have caught up, we will be able to remove all restrictions. The objective of the bill introduced by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], is deserving and worthy. I had hoped that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] would be on the floor at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I discussed the matter with the Senator from Mississippi. He is agreeable to the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. THYE. I discussed the matter with the Senator from Mississippi on the floor earlier today. I told him that I was prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter from Mr. Earl L. Butz, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, dated May 19, 1955, printed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1955.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: This is in response to your request for our views on the

revision of S. 153 which was offered in the Senate on May 17.

As we understand it, it is now proposed to modify the State allotment formula as it now appears in the Rural Electrification Act so that 25 (in place of 50) percent of the annual electrification loan funds shall be allotted among the States in proportion to the number of unelectrified farms. The remaining 75 percent could be loaned without allotment, subject to the limitation that not more than 25 (in place of 10) percent thereof may be employed in any one State. The effect of the proposed amendment of subsection (e) would be to release that part of the funds subject to State allotment which had not been obligated or loaned during the first 6 months of the fiscal year for which they are made available so that they may be loaned in any State subject only to the 25-percent limitation. All funds not loaned or obligated during the fiscal year for which they are made available would be carried over and be available for loan in subsequent years in any State without allotment subject only to the 25-percent limitation.

The proposed revision will afford greater flexibility in the administration of the electrification loan program than is possible under the existing State allotment formula. Applying the revised allotment formula to the electrification loan funds carried in the 1956 appropriations, and using electrified farms as of July 1, 1954, as the formula base, we believe that the revised formula will permit the making of any loans for which applications are now on hand or which to our knowledge are being worked upon in the field.

We would prefer, for the reasons presented to the subcommittee which conducted hearings on S. 153, that the administration of the loan program be placed on the basis of actual needs for funds to carry out the purposes of the act rather than on a formula which is based on the ratio of unelectrified farms, a factor which is not determinative of needs today. We shall, of course, carry out to the best of our ability any statutory directive received from the Congress.

It would help to clarify the intent of the proposed amendment if it were revised to read as follows:

(c) "Twenty-five percent of the annual sums herein made available or appropriated for loans for rural electrification pursuant to sections 4 and 5 of this title shall be allotted yearly by the Administrator for loans in the several States in the proportion which the number of their farms not then receiving central station electric service bears to the total number of farms of the United States not then receiving such service: *Provided*, That if any part of such sums are not loaned or obligated during the first 6 months of the fiscal year for which they are made available, such part shall thereafter be available for loans by the Administrator without allotment: *Provided, however*, That not more than 25 percent of said sums may be employed in any one State, or in all of the Territories. The Administrator shall within 90 days after the beginning of each fiscal year determine for each State and for the United States the number of farms not then receiving such service."

(d) No change.

(e) "If any part of the annual sums made available for the purposes of this act are not loaned or obligated during the fiscal year for which they are made available, such unexpended or unobligated sums shall be available for loans by the Administrator in the following year or years without allotment: *Provided, however*, That not more than 25 percent of said sums for rural electrification loans may be employed in any one State or all of the Territories."

It would be helpful, if, during the discussion of the bill, attention is drawn to the

effect of the formula on the reserve or contingency authorizations such as have been included in the REA loan items in recent years. In the event S. 153 is enacted prior to June 30, 1955, with the allotment formula revised as proposed, we would interpret the amendment as freeing the current reserve authorization of \$35 million, if it is drawn upon, as well as to any other unobligated funds, from the State allotment restrictions, since the first 6 months of fiscal 1955 have already elapsed. Further, with respect to the reserve loan authorization of \$100 million provided for fiscal 1956, in the event these funds are not drawn upon until after December 31, 1955, we would consider them available for loan free of the State allotment formula and subject only to the 25-percent limitation.

We believe this is a reasonable interpretation of the effect of the proposed language with respect to these funds under the applicable language of the appropriation acts. However, if it is questioned, we would prefer that it be clarified now for our guidance in administering the act.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

EARL L. BUTZ,  
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope the amendment will be agreed to and the bill passed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I am happy to see that a solution of the difficulty has been reached. I have felt for some time that there was need for greater leeway in the handling of REA funds in the discretion of the Administrator.

A year ago, when we had before us the question of voting additional funds for loans by REA, I voted for the additional \$35 million for the discretionary fund because I felt the additional sum was needed. My reason for so voting is the same reason which leads me to vote for the bill at this time. It is to permit the Administrator to place the greatest emphasis where the greatest need exists. Therefore, I am glad to vote for the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have agreed with the point made by the Senator from South Dakota that the REA formula needed some modifications to meet the realities. However, I have never agreed, and do not agree now, that the formula ought to be abolished. In fact, I believe that would be a serious mistake, from the standpoint of the REA associations. It is unfortunate that those who undertook to abolish the formula did not, instead, undertake to revise it according to the realities. However, the REA associations agree on that course of action, except the association in the State of Mississippi. I understand that the associations voted unanimously in favor of it at their national convention.

The REA Administrator has seen fit to ask Congress to abolish the formula entirely. The Senate committee at one time agreed. I am not being critical of the members of the committee, but I wish to point out that no legislative committee has ever undertaken a review of the formula so as to bring it into line with present needs from the standpoint of electrification, replacements, transmission lines, and a number of other electrical items with which I am not too

familiar, but which have to do with increasing the amount of electricity to the people who are now being served. I believe that such a review was essential in order to obtain a really practical formula under which Congress could appropriate money. Perhaps the House committee will hold some hearings on the subject and develop facts along that line.

However, we are face to face with the proposition of retaining a part of the formula, and the amendment is worked out along that line. The members of the Committee on Appropriations have been greatly interested in having some kind of a formula retained. I believe that if no formula is provided with reference to these matters, trouble will soon develop for the REA's, popular and powerful as they may be. So I am certainly glad that some measure of the formula is being retained. I think it will serve a good purpose. I think the bill as amended will be stronger.

I wish to thank the junior Senator from Minnesota and the senior Senator from Minnesota for their patient consideration of the matter.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I recognize that the Senator from Mississippi has been greatly concerned because he wished to be certain that no farm or community in his State would be placed in a position of jeopardy because of lack of funds. I can fully understand his concern. For that reason I was most anxious that there should be a meeting of minds and the best solution of the problem should be reached, so that the Administrator of the REA program would be unshackled and could make available, in his discretion, as much of the funds as might be possible, and that every year the appropriation could be reviewed.

I was speaking for the cosponsors of the bill when I stated that we would accept the amendment and permit action to be taken on the bill. I also stated that the Senator from Mississippi and I had discussed it since the Senate reconvened today.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's remarks. It is my opinion, as an individual Senator, that we should have gone a little further into the matter of actual need. So far as my State is concerned, I think the conditions will be taken care of under the amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I would assure every citizen of the State of Mississippi that so long as the distinguished Senator is a Member of this body they will have no need to worry about whether they will receive the necessary funds, because the Senator will see that they get the funds. That I can say without any question.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the sentiments of the Senator from Minnesota. He is overgenerous, indeed.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I have been interested in the colloquy between the Sen-

ator from Mississippi and the Senators from Minnesota. I want to be sure that the citizens of the State of Kansas will be protected by the amendment on which the Senators have agreed. Are the allocations such that the citizens of Kansas will be protected?

Mr. STENNIS. I think I can assure the Senator from Kansas that his State will be taken care of under this amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to include in my remarks the Senator from Kansas. I know of no two Members of the Senate who have greater concern for the farming or rural areas of their respective States than the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Mississippi have. Both of them work for the interests of their citizens.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the statement just made by the Senator from Minnesota disarms me, of course. I had in mind some rewriting of the present language so as to provide such a reallocation of funds as would enable as many persons as possible to be served with electricity. As I understand the statement of the Senator from Mississippi, he is rather insisting that Congress shall have some control over the funds. Therefore, does the Senator from Mississippi feel that under this new provision all the States will be properly cared for?

Mr. STENNIS. I do. The money is to be released to the Administrator to use in his discretion, with the limitation that he cannot use more than 25 percent of the other 75 percent of the funds in any one State. I think that will take care of the situation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think there is no doubt that the State of Kansas and the other States are most generously taken care of. I have the personal assurance of the REA Administrator to that effect.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this colloquy has convinced me that good work has been done in trying to draft an amendment which will protect the citizens of all the States. I appreciate what has been done.

Mr. STENNIS. At the same time, it protects the legislative viewpoint. I have always insisted that there should be some kind of a formula.

Mr. President, under the circumstances as they have been stated, I shall support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD prior to the taking of the vote on Senate bill 153 a statement prepared by me, and also a letter from Mr. Ancher Nelsen, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALLOTT IN BEHALF OF THE PASSAGE OF S. 153, AS AMENDED

I have listened carefully to the debate and read much of the RECORD concerning this matter and I would like to compliment all

the Senators who took part in the debate on the objective manner in which this most important subject has been handled.

I should like to also compliment the distinguished majority leader and my able colleague, the distinguished minority leader, for their part in the presentation of this proposed legislation on the floor of the Senate.

The passage of S. 153 is most essential to the rural areas of Colorado and I am informed by Mr. Ancher Nelsen, the capable Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, that Colorado is the only State in which the operation of the State allotment formula contained in the Rural Electrification Act is presently preventing prompt action on approval of loans.

I am informed that the processing of four loans in Colorado, totaling in amount approximately \$13,300,000, is nearing completion. These loans are for generation, transmission, and distribution requirements. However, under the present State allotment formula of the Rural Electrification Administration, the funds remaining available for loan purposes in Colorado are approximately \$7,200,000. This indicates that the amount required is \$6,100,000 short of being able to meet the legitimate applications. This shortage exists because of the allotment formula not because of the money, which is now available in the loan fund. As has been said before, there remains in the national fund available for loans at this time \$108,000,000.

On the anniversary of REA many laudatory statements were most justifiably made by my colleagues in the Senate but I should like to add one paragraph as a tribute to the sound business philosophy behind the Rural Electrification program when properly managed. As an example, and to show that Rural Electrification is no give-away program, I should like to call my colleagues' attention to the Morgan County Rural Electrification Association in northeastern Colorado. This Rural Electrification Association is paying off the first portion of their system indebtedness 17 years ahead of schedule and, in addition, have been able to refund \$127,000 to their consumers in their 1954 electrical bills. This is a patronage dividend equal to 13 percent of their gross electric bills for that year. Rural Colorado is now more than 93.8 percent electrified but additional work must be done. I am sure that, if time permitted, I could cite other examples of good business management in county rural electrification associations in Colorado. At the same time I am pleased to say that generally the cooperation has been good between the rural electric associations and the private power utilities that supply the municipal areas of our State. At the present time, they each seem to recognize the legitimate function of the other and I believe there is no intention of either to jeopardize the other's rightful and lawful function.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT  
OF AGRICULTURE,  
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1955.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: This is in response to your request for information on the status of pending electric loans in Colorado and on any matters that may delay their approval.

Colorado is the only State in which the operation of the State allotment formula contained in the Rural Electrification Act is working to prevent the prompt meeting of loan needs. Processing of 4 loans in Colorado, totaling in amount approximately \$13,300,000, is nearing completion. These loans are for generation, transmission, and distribution needs. Funds remaining available for loan purposes in Colorado under the



limitations of the allotment formula approximate \$7,200,000. This reflects a shortage from the amount required of more than \$6,100,000.

This shortage exists because of the allotment formula and in spite of a national remaining availability of loan funds approximating \$108 million.

Following the appropriations hearings, we estimated that our needs for Colorado in excess of the State ceiling would amount to approximately \$5,500,000. However, we pointed out that the loans for this amount would be processed in May or June and probably would be approved after July 1. Since that time, however, the situation has become more urgent in view of recent developments. First, as work has progressed on the processing of the applications the figure needed for the State has had to be somewhat increased. Second, the situation requiring prompt action on the loans has intensified. The area is critically in need of additional facilities for generation, transmission, and distribution of power.

The Department is giving exhaustive study to every possible avenue of relief to meet this situation. We deplore the possibility of being forced to delay action on these loans until the new fiscal year—a delay which, in view of the short construction period in Colorado, could be harmful to the satisfactory progress of the electrification effort. A supplemental authorization of about \$115 million would be required in order to obtain the \$6,100,000 needed, by reason of the operation of the allotment formula. Enactment of legislation to amend the Rural Electrification Act by eliminating the formula, now before both Houses of the Congress, seems to offer the most orderly and expeditious way of meeting this urgent need.

Sincerely yours,

ANCHER NELSEN,  
Administrator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (S. 153) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### FILLING OF TEMPORARY VACANCIES IN THE CONGRESS CAUSED BY DISASTER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 234, Senate Joint Resolution 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. J. Res. 8) to amend the Constitution to authorize governors to fill temporary vacancies in the Congress caused by a disaster.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

#### "ARTICLE—

"On any date that the total number of vacancies in the House of Representatives

exceeds half of the authorized membership thereof, and for a period of 60 days thereafter, the executive authority of each State shall have power to make temporary appointments to fill any vacancies, including those happening during such period, in the representation from his State in the House of Representatives. Any person temporarily appointed to fill any such vacancy shall serve until the people fill the vacancy by election as provided for by article I, section 2, of the Constitution."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the membership of the Senate, particularly the able minority leader, to the fact that this is a joint resolution to amend the Constitution, and, in accordance with our general practice and our agreement ever since the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has been in a leadership position, and I have occupied a similar position, we expect to have a yea-and-nay vote on a joint resolution of this kind.

Therefore, I should like to give notice to the Senate that at the conclusion of the debate on the joint resolution there will be a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, my remarks will be addressed to Senate Joint Resolution 8, which is now the unfinished business.

During the past 9 or 10 years we have all been aware of the tremendous scientific progress in nuclear fission and of its potentialities for both good and evil. While we have the greatest hope that this tremendous new development will eventually be directed toward peaceful ends, it is still the better part of prudence for a nation, as well as individuals, to insure as far as possible, against all eventualities.

At the outset, I wish to pay tribute to the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], for being one of the first among us to take note of the constitutional problems I am about to discuss. I shall have more to say later about the part he has played in the development of the proposal now under consideration.

The Senator from California first introduced a joint resolution on this subject in the 81st Congress, and reintroduced similar proposals in the 82d and 83d Congresses. I also introduced a similar measure in the 83d Congress.

The resolution offered by the senior Senator from California in the 83d Congress was adopted by a vote of 70 to 1.

The Senator from California did not introduce such a resolution at this session. If he had, his measure would have been reported, instead of the one which is now before the Senate.

I hardly need remind the Senate of what would happen if 1 of the 20 megaton thermonuclear weapons were exploded on the Nation's Capitol. This weapon, which is already in existence, is the equivalent of 20 million tons of TNT and is about 1,000 times more powerful than the atomic bomb which was dropped on Hiroshima, according to a statement by Admiral Strauss and Dr. Libby in official information issued by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Following a surface burst of this weapon, it could be expected that a crater perhaps a mile and a half across and

200 feet deep would be blasted out of the earth.

The explosion of a similar weapon in the Pacific was sufficient to have buried 14 Pentagon buildings, and to have caused damage to a large additional area.

The fireball would blanket an area about 4 miles across. Blast pressures would cause the complete destruction of all structures and installations within a radius of 5 miles from the point of burst; in other words, an area 10 miles across.

Within this area of complete destruction we could expect fatal casualties of about 90 percent of the people, and there would be casualties of lesser magnitude throughout concentric circles for the next 15 miles. I use the word "lesser" advisedly—depending, of course, on the question of whether warning might be sufficient to secure shelter against radioactive fallout.

The question with which the Senate is concerned, in the measure before us today, is what would happen to the Government of the United States, from a constitutional viewpoint, under such conditions as I have outlined.

There is no question that government of a sort would survive, but what we want to assure is that representative, constitutional democracy could be reconstituted.

In providing for a method of government which would best reflect the public will the constitutional drafters produced a tripartite authority, composed of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. They designed the Constitution as not simply a fair-weather document, but a document to function during war as well as peace. It is no reflection on the framers of the Constitution, however, that they could not possibly foresee a 20-megaton weapon when they met in Philadelphia to draft this Nation's most basic document.

Considering first the executive branch of the Government, the Constitution authorized the Congress to provide for any sudden vacancy occurring in the office of the President after the succession of the Vice President to that position. Public Law 199, passed by the 80th Congress, provided that the line of succession after the President and Vice President should be the Speaker of the House, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the Secretaries of State, Treasury, and Defense, the Attorney General, the Postmaster General, and the Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, in that order.

Members of the judiciary are, of course, appointed by the President, with the consent of the Senate, and the functioning and perpetuating of that office presents no great difficulties.

In the legislative branch we have two equal houses. Under the Constitution, as expanded by the 17th amendment, the State executives are authorized to fill vacancies in the Senate temporarily by appointment pending the next election. There is no such authority, however, in connection with vacancies occurring in the House of Representatives. Thus there would be no way of immediately reconstituting the House should there be a disaster to the Capitol.

As I mentioned earlier, one of the first to recognize this potential danger to our constitutional democracy was the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND]. He introduced measures in the last three Congresses proposing an amendment to the Constitution. As I also said earlier, if he had introduced a similar bill at this session, I believe his proposal would have been the one to be reported at this time.

I was first made aware of this problem a number of years ago by a letter from the President of the Board of Trustees of the McCallie School of Chattanooga, Dr. J. P. McCallie, which is set forth on pages 10 and 11 of the record of hearings. I submitted a proposed amendment in the last Congress and again in this Congress.

During the study of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments and the hearings on this proposal we found a great difficulty in the original proposal introduced by me and in the one the Senator from California had introduced. Both of these proposals predicated the appointive power on the existence of a national disaster or emergency. During the hearings it became evident that certain problems would arise if the power conferred could be invoked only in the event of a disaster causing a given number of vacancies. For instance, it would become necessary to decide what officer of the Government should proclaim the existence of a disaster and then to determine which of the vacancies were actually caused by the disaster or which were occasioned by natural causes. The proposal now before the Senate avoids these problems by eliminating reference to disasters.

The subcommittee was helped greatly in its consideration of the problem by letters received from a number of distinguished constitutional lawyers, including Dr. Edward S. Corwin, Dr. Noel T. Dowling, William W. Crosskey, and Harold G. Gallagher, all of which are printed in the appendix to the hearings which were held on March 15 of this year. It was largely as a result of their points of view and their statements of what they believe should be done that the resolution now under consideration was recast so as to avoid the confusion, possible litigation, and uncertainty which would arise, first, in determining what a disaster was, and also in setting forth in a constitutional amendment who should proclaim a disaster.

The resolution now before the Senate provides that on any date the total number of vacancies in the House of Representatives exceeds one-half of the authorized membership, that is 218, and for a period of 60 days thereafter, the executive authority of each State shall have power to make temporary appointments to fill any vacancies then present or which may occur during that period in the representation from his State in the House of Representatives. Any person temporarily appointed to fill any such vacancy is permitted to serve only until the people fill the vacancy by election as provided by article I, section 2, of the Constitution. The Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], a member of the subcommittee, was very helpful in perfecting

this language, and it has been approved by both the subcommittee and the full Judiciary Committee.

As Senators will observe from the language of the proposal, it does in fact permit the invocation of this extraordinary power only when this country is in a period of national emergency or disaster, but avoids the language which was so troublesome. A commonsense interpretation would dictate that whenever vacancies in the House of Representatives exceed one-half of the authorized membership, the Nation would be confronted by a national emergency or disaster in the ordinary sense of those terms. Consequently, it is clear that this extraordinary power will rarely be used, if ever—and we can all hope that it will never be used. If it must be used, however, the period within which governors may exercise their authority is limited by the terms of the resolution to 60 days after the last date on which the vacancies in the House exceed one-half of the membership.

The terms of the appointment are likewise limited by direct reference in the resolution to article I, section 2, of the Constitution. Article I, section 2, contains two provisions which limit the term of these temporary appointees. First, there is the provision requiring the Governors of the States to issue writs of election to fill vacancies as they happen in the House of Representatives. Secondly, there is the constitutional requirement that elections for Members of the House of Representatives shall take place every 2 years. Thus the terms of these appointees may be limited by either the holding of a general or special election. As I see it, special elections would likely be held within 60 days or 90 days following the creation of the vacancies, but no such time limit has been established on the terms of the appointees for the reason that an atomic attack on other cities might have impaired the election machinery within the States so that elections could not be held within that period. Nevertheless, it is clearly the sense of those who have thus far approved the proposed legislation that the appointments shall be temporary and that the Governors of the States shall be obliged to fill the vacancies by election as soon as possible and practicable. The requirements of article I, section 2, of the Constitution on the Governors are mandatory, and if they should unreasonably delay calling elections, they would be subject to writs of mandamus.

Mr. President, I am glad we are considering this proposal at a moment when tension is somewhat relaxed. That, I believe, is exactly the time when we should be considering an amendment such as this. I hope that we are making lasting progress toward a peaceful world. But the fact is that we have had two wars in 37 years, and if another should unfortunately come, then it might be too late for the consideration of such a measure as this.

I call attention to the hearings, which show that the agencies of the executive directly concerned with civil defense and the continuity of the Government approve the proposed amendment. These

executive agencies approved a similar proposal during the last Congress, when the joint resolution of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] was before the Committee on the Judiciary. The State governors who responded to the committee's invitation to submit views during this year likewise approved of its purpose.

With some knowledge of the tremendous destructive power of thermonuclear weapons, it would, in my judgment, be the height of folly to delay submitting this amendment. The proposed constitutional amendment would require at least 2 years for ratification, since it must be approved by a two-thirds vote both here and in the House, and ratified by three-fourths of the State legislatures, many of which meet only every 2 years.

In considering this proposed amendment, I ask the Senators to think of the institution it seeks to preserve. If a situation such as this resolution foresees should arise, then we can be sure that the Chief Executive, whoever he might be, would act promptly so that chaos would not develop. But aside from that consideration, a situation of this type would be replete with historic and far-reaching consequences. A President in such times would welcome the counsel and legislative assistance of Congress. And the people, whose rights would be so vitally affected by these decisions, would require participation in them through their representatives.

I hope, Mr. President, that the joint resolution will be approved, as one containing a similar idea was approved by the Senate last year.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. STENNIS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield first to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to join with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee and fully endorse the proposed constitutional amendment, provided for in Senate Joint Resolution 8, which is before the Senate at this time. I commend the Senator for having introduced and shepherded the proposal through the committee.

As has been so generously indicated by the distinguished Senator, this has been a matter which has caused me some concern ever since I was a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and members of the committee gained additional knowledge as to what possibility might happen to our constitutional processes.

I may also say to the Senator from Tennessee I had proposed a joint resolution for introduction in this session, but when the Senator from Tennessee very promptly introduced his joint resolution on the 6th of January, so far as I was concerned I deferred to him, as I had no pride of authorship in the matter. I knew we were both interested in the end result, and I was very happy to see the joint resolution of the Senator from Tennessee. Therefore, I did not introduce my joint resolution which was similar to the one which had been debated on the floor.



I think the resolution in its present form is an improvement over the one the Senate acted on last year and overwhelmingly approved by a vote, I believe, of 70 to 1.

While it is not within our province either to predict or to suggest what the other House of Congress may do, I hope it will promptly be able to act on the joint resolution so that the proposed amendment can be submitted speedily to the several States. As the Senator from Tennessee has so ably pointed out, it is a form of insurance which we hope we shall never be called upon to use, but it seeks to correct what certainly is a weakness in our constitutional system.

While in the event a disaster of such great magnitude should befall, the Government of the United States would be able to function, because the President of the United States, or whoever his successor might be, would see to it that the processes of government were carried on. I think we have a responsibility to see to it that the processes of constitutional government are adequately safeguarded. Constitutional government under our system requires the ability of both the House of Representatives and the Senate to act.

Under the situation which existed at the time the Constitution was drafted there was no likelihood of the occurrence of a disaster of the magnitude which is now possible, whereby a majority of the Members of the House might be wiped out in a single instant. Science has progressed considerably since that time.

So far as the Senate is concerned, there would be no problem, because if we were to be obliterated today, the governors of our respective States could, if the need were sufficiently urgent, make appointments immediately thereafter, and new Senators could be on their way to wherever the seat of government might be, and could function as the Senate of the United States. But that is not true of the House of Representatives. Because of the delay which would result under the processes of writs of election, and particularly if we visualize the disturbed conditions which would exist in the country in such an emergency, and the difficulty of holding normal elections, a gap might be left in which that great body could not function. It is the House of Congress in which tax legislation originates, and where, as a custom, appropriation bills have originated, and the House has other clearly defined constitutional functions. If the House could not act, it would handicap the proper functioning of the Government under our constitutional processes.

So I wish to commend the Senator from Tennessee, and to join with him in urging prompt and overwhelming approval of Senate Joint Resolution 8.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator from California very much.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Tennessee in yielding to me, Mr. President.

The brief remarks I wish to make will be made with great deference to the present author and the prior author of

the proposed constitutional amendment. Last year, when the joint resolution proposing this amendment passed the Senate by a vote of 70 to 1, I was the 1 Senator who voted against it. Later I received a very good letter, the author of which said he did not know whether I stated my reasons for voting against the proposed constitutional amendment, but that if I had not, he suggested that I not give them, because he admired the idea of having 1 Member stand against the rest of the membership of the Senate, whereas if I gave my reason for doing so, he might not agree with me. [Laughter.] Mr. President, I think that was a splendid letter, and perhaps today I should follow that advice.

However, I shall briefly state my reasons for believing we are getting the cart before the horse in reference to matters of this kind. I think it is a very serious thing to amend the Constitution in any way; but, in the first place, I think the proposed amendment would be evidence that we would be legislating in an atmosphere of fear.

This morning I read a news item to the effect that an Air Force general had said Russia has air superiority or air equality with us. I do not think he was correct in making that statement; but I believe that such statements instill a sense of fear in the minds of our people.

Somewhere else I read that someone advised the people that they should apply for FHA loans in order to build shelters to protect themselves from atomic attacks. I do not agree with that recommendation, because I do not think any attack is imminent; and I believe that such statements tend to instill a false sense of fear in the minds of the people.

Mr. President, if we pass the pending joint resolution, I believe we shall be sending to the people another message to the effect that we believe an attack is either imminent or probable, and that we are afraid of what might happen. This is merely another instance which demonstrates, I believe, that we could not give the Russians a better series of propaganda points, to be used throughout the world as evidence that we are afraid of them, that we think we are going to be attacked, and soon. I think we have overdone this thing, Mr. President.

I believe that by such means we help create a sense of fear in the minds of ourselves and in the minds of all the people of the Nation, instead of giving them sound assurance that we shall carry on and shall strengthen our defenses. By giving such assurance we shall bring about calmness and abiding faith that we shall continue to be the leading Nation in the world.

Mr. President, I believe it is one of the great heritages of the House of Representatives that no person has ever taken a seat or cast a vote in that body except by virtue of election by the people. That is a great pillar in our form of government, and it is one which I do not wish to have destroyed on the mere possibility that a way off yonder, somewhere, at some time, the Russians may attempt to attack us. Even if such an attack were probable, I think the physical facts are such that we certainly shall have a fair warning of a few hours or a

few minutes, and certainly sufficient time for the Members of Congress to leave this building.

If that great heritage of the House of Representatives is to be destroyed, let the suggestion come first from the House of Representatives, Mr. President. The House did not even take up this proposal last year, as I understand, after the joint resolution was passed by this body by a vote of 70 to 1.

So I submit that if any change is to be made in the constitutional provision regarding the election of the Members of the House of Representatives, that great institution—and it is great; it is perhaps the greatest of the legislative branches of the Government—in the event fate should decree that steps should be taken to replace its Members, at least we can in good countenance await a suggestion from the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee for yielding to me.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, 2 years ago, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and later as chairman of its Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I presided at long and extended hearings on this subject.

This year, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has devoted very long and, I may say, very weary hours not only in going over the testimony which was adduced last year, but also in listening to a group of new witnesses. In considering the proposed constitutional amendment, he called many meetings of the subcommittee, at which he presided as chairman; and I wish to say that he went into the matter with great interest, and in the most minute detail.

Mr. President, it is not often that a body such as ours has a Member who will devote such long hours to a task. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee has devoted many, many hours to the proposed constitutional amendment. It is very natural, and often occurs, that the Senator who presides at such hearings will ask another Senator to preside over them at least for a part of the time. However, in this instance, the Senator from Tennessee sat through all the hearings and all the interrogations, except in the case of a few questions which some of us asked on the side. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee had, of course, the assistance of an able staff, which in my opinion did an extremely fine job; and in that connection I desire to pay tribute especially to Wayne Smithey, who has helped the committee immeasurably in its consideration of the proposed constitutional amendment.

Mr. President, I believe that the proposed constitutional amendment provided for by the pending joint resolution is an improvement over the one for which the Senate voted a year ago; and I hope the joint resolution will be unanimously passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I should like to comment briefly on some of the observations which have been

made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

In the first place, this matter is not one relating only to the succession of the Members of the House of Representatives. If it involved only matters affecting the House of Representatives, there might be some validity to the argument that we should not be concerned with the proposal until after the House of Representatives had acted on it. However, this joint resolution relates to the preservation of constitutional government, a matter in which this body and every person in the Nation has a great interest. Not only do we wish to be sure that the Government of the United States will continue, in the event of an emergency, but we wish to have constitutional government continue. The 17th amendment, which was ratified in 1913, affects the election of Members of the Senate. I remember that at that time many of those who were particularly interested in having Senators elected by the people were Members of the House of Representatives. So in both these matters, which relate to carrying on our constitutional government and giving the people more "say" about it, all of us have an interest.

As to the question of alarming the people, Mr. President, let me say I have always felt that we follow the best course of action when we tell the people the facts. If the people know the facts, they do not become unduly alarmed. They form calm judgments.

So far as concerns the possibility of alarming the people because of a civil-defense program, in that event it might be that the making of any appropriations for civil defense would tend to alarm the people. However, the people need to know the facts. I am sure they wish to know that the situation is in such shape that they will be represented in the Congress of the United States, no matter what emergency may arise.

If we accede to this argument, we might as well say a husband should refrain from buying insurance for fear of alarming his wife or a parent should refrain from having his child vaccinated for fear of alarming the child.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert:

That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"On any date that the total number of vacancies in the House of Representatives exceeds half of the authorized membership thereof, and for a period of 60 days thereafter, the executive authority of each State shall have power to make temporary appointments to fill any vacancies, including those happening during such period, in the representation from his State in the House of Representatives. Any person temporarily appointed to fill any such vacancy shall serve until the people fill the vacancy by election

as provided for by article I, section 2, of the Constitution."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee. I note that the preliminary section of the amendment embraces a cut-off date, which is a departure from any draftsmanship I have ever seen in the case of constitutional amendments. I am always concerned about submitting proposed amendments to the Constitution unless there is some definite date which will determine whether or not the amendment is to be approved by the requisite three-fourths of the States. This amendment does not specifically say that it shall be inoperative if it is not ratified within 7 years. How does the Senator from Tennessee construe this language? It provides that it shall be valid if it is ratified within 7 years, but it does not say that it shall not be effective if it is not ratified within 7 years.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That question was discussed with some of the witnesses who appeared before our committee. The general idea was that it was better not to make the 7-year provision a part of the proposed constitutional amendment itself. It was felt that that would clutter up the Constitution. Sometimes that is done. We wanted to put the 7-year limitation in the preamble. So the intention of the preamble is that it must be ratified within 7 years in order to be effective. I think that is what the preamble means. It provides:

That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress.

Article V of the present Constitution contains approximately the same language. It provides:

The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States—

And so forth. So I believe the language of the joint resolution follows almost exactly the language prescribed for amending the Constitution.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not concerned about the fact that the proposed amendment would be a legal and appropriate part of the Constitution if ratified within 7 years. What troubles me is that if it is not ratified within 7 years, there is the likelihood that it will be circulating in space. At the present time a number of proposed amendments to the Constitution which have been submitted are floating around in space. Some of them have been ratified by 1 State, and some by 10 or 15 States. It seems to me that there should be a cutoff date in proposed constitutional amendments, if they possess sufficient merit to commend themselves to the legislatures within a given period of time.

Let me say that I heartily approve the Senator's proposed amendment to the Constitution. But there should be no question about the termination date. I wonder if the Senator would object to inserting, on page 2, line 8, after the word "Constitution", the word "only."

Mr. KEFAUVER. So as to read—"to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified—" and so forth?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should have no objection to such an amendment. I am advised by Mr. Smithey, of our staff, that he discussed with the legislative counsel's office the question the Senator has raised, and it was their opinion that the proposed amendment would not be floating around in space. However, I do not want the contingency mentioned by the Senator from Georgia to occur, any more than he does. I think the insertion of the word "only" would make clear the intent.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then, Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, on page 2, line 8, after the word "Constitution," to insert the word "only."

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the suggestion, and I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on the question of final passage of the joint resolution, I ask for the yeas and nays. The majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] has already indicated that there should be a yeas-and-nays vote on all proposed amendments to the Constitution.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 8. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE],



the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I further announce that on this vote the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], if present and voting, would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senators from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY and Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 76, nays 3, as follows:

#### YEAS—76

Aiken	Ervin	Martin, Pa.
Allott	Frear	McClellan
Anderson	Green	McNamara
Barkley	Hayden	Millikin
Barrett	Hennings	Monroney
Beall	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bender	Hill	Murray
Bennett	Holland	Neuberger
Bricker	Hruska	Pastore
Bridges	Humphrey	Payne
Bush	Ives	Potter
Butler	Jackson	Purtell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Clements	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Kuchel	Sparkman
Curtis	Langer	Thurmond
Daniel	Lehman	Thye
Dirksen	Long	Watkins
Douglas	Magnuson	Williams
Dworshak	Malone	Young
Eastland	Mansfield	
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	

#### NAYS—3

Byrd	George	Stennis
------	--------	---------

#### NOT VOTING—17

Bible	Jenner	Scott
Duff	Kennedy	Smathers
Flanders	McCarthy	Symington
Fulbright	Morse	Welker
Goldwater	Neely	Wiley
Gore	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the joint resolution is passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to amend the Consti-

tution to authorize governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives."

#### DELAYS IN DISTRIBUTION OF SALK VACCINE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, yesterday we learned that once again it has been decided to hold up distribution of the Salk antipolio vaccine because of confusion—the term used in the official explanation—confusion about the reports of tests of vaccine produced by another one of the private firms licensed to make Salk vaccine. Once again parents are left in doubt as to when their children may have the benefit of adequate, properly safeguarded inoculations with the wonderful new medicine.

Mr. President, when it comes to the proper handling of problems vitally affecting the health of the Nation's children, the present national administration could learn much from the example of our northern neighbors in Canada. This is not a political issue, and we must study what Canada has done in this program.

During the period of the development and the nationwide trials of the Salk vaccine, there has been close cooperation between our Canadian friends and those in charge of our own polio research. Canada suffered its own worst polio epidemic 2 years ago, and Canadians were glad to be able to make important contributions to the development of a means of eliminating this dread disease. For example, much of the fluid for growing the polio virus cultures was produced in the Connaught Medical Research Laboratories at the University of Toronto, and Canadian children participated in the statistical testing program.

#### CANADA HAD VACCINE PROGRAM READY EARLY

But on top of this valuable cooperation toward the final success of the vaccine, there has also been one important difference:

The announcement, on April 12, 1955, of that long-sought success found the Government of Canada prepared. On April 12, the Government of Canada had a national program. The Government of the great United States had none.

Canada has undertaken the distribution of Salk vaccine in accordance with a strict and orderly program which can command the confidence of Canadian parents, and which stands in sharp contrast to chaotic confusion which has developed in the United States in the 6 weeks since the vaccine was heralded as the answer to the dreaded infantile paralysis.

On April 12, 1955, the Minister of National Health and Welfare, the Honorable Paul Martin, was able to announce a comprehensive national program which had been developed in anticipation of the success of the vaccine. I think it is worthwhile to quote to the Senate an excerpt from his statement, because it speaks for itself in demonstrating the contrast with the unpreparedness of the Eisenhower administration. The Canadian minister referred to the need to complete vaccina-

tion of children before the beginning of the potential polio season on July 1. He then said:

Because of these considerations and the fact that the production and testing of the vaccine is a long and complicated process extending over several months, the Government (that is, the Government of Canada), decided last fall that, although effectiveness of the vaccine had not yet been conclusively established, no time should be lost in making plans for the production of vaccine so that substantial quantities might be available in time for this year's polio season.

I invite special attention to the two following paragraphs from the statement of Canada's Minister of National Health and Welfare:

Accordingly, arrangements were worked out, in cooperation with the ten provincial governments, under which the federal and provincial governments would share on a 50-50 basis the cost of underwriting the production of the vaccine at the Connaught Medical Research Laboratories. As a result, sufficient supplies are already available in Canada to immunize more than 500,000 children in selected early school-age groups under the active direction and supervision of provincial and local departments of health.

For this production program and for related research carried out at the Connaught Laboratories, the Institute of Microbiology and Hygiene in Montreal, and other institutions, the Federal Government has provided grants exceeding \$500,000.

Has any Senator heard any convincing explanations why our own Secretary of Health and Welfare could not have made such a statement on April 12, 1955?

COST: \$1.50 IN CANADA, \$4.20 IN UNITED STATES

Is there any convincing explanation why, 6 weeks after that date, our own Department of Health and Welfare should be once again stopping the already hopelessly delayed distribution of Salk vaccine, while they look into what they call "this whole very confused picture?"

Mr. President, there is another facet of the Canadian program which will be of interest to the American people. The Canadian Government obtains the supplies for its program of distributing the vaccine by purchasing the entire output of the Connaught Laboratories. The cost of the vaccine—of enough carefully tested vaccine for three immunizing inoculations—is \$1.50. One dollar and a half, not for each shot, but for the vaccine for all three shots. That is the cost of the vaccine for the Canadian Government's program. There is no other price for private purchasers—because the government contracted for the entire output, no supplies from these laboratories are available through private channels in Canada.

I think the Senate will recall, Mr. President, that an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare recently told the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that the cost to the United States Government of privately produced vaccine would be about \$3.00 for a 3 cubic centimeter vial, and that through private channels 3 cubic centimeters would cost wholesalers from \$3 to \$3.60, and physicians from \$4.20 to \$4.50. I leave it to your imagination what the cost of shots may be to the children who

are able to gain access to immunization through these channels—after, that is, the “very confused picture” has been cleared up and distribution begins once again. But the children of Canada get the same vaccine, without the confusion, at a cost to their government of \$1.50 for three vaccinations.

**DEEDS MUST SPEAK LOUDER THAN WORDS**

I repeat, Mr. President, the accomplishment of our northern neighbors in preparing and carrying out this program contrasts tellingly with the confusion resulting from our own lack of a program. I think the American people are entitled to know the Canadian story, to learn that such problems can be handled rightly by a government which, when the public interest demands it, is not afraid to govern.

I should like to digress for a moment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In the first place, I am sure the Senator from Oregon is familiar with the fact that the 1951 census of Canada, according to the World Almanac, shows that the population of Canada is 14 million. That is slightly larger than the population of the State of California, and it is considerably smaller than the population of the State of New York. I am sure the Senator is also familiar with the fact that the so-called polio season varies considerably between the United States and Canada. Polio apparently is encouraged by warm weather. Figures show that the States in the northern areas had proportionately fewer cases of polio than States in the dry and more southern areas.

As I understand from testimony which I have read, the polio season seems to start in the southern portion of the United States and then gradually works northward.

Is it not possible that Canada is not faced with the same problem of a changing polio season, as we are in the United States, and that practically all of Canada is in the general area of States in the northernmost part of our country, with the exception perhaps of some of the New England States?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the distinguished minority leader for his observation. The Senator is correct when he says that Canada has approximately 10 percent of the population of the United States, and perhaps even less than that.

However, I do not understand how that fact has anything to do with the basic policy of whether our Government should have been as prepared as the Canadian Government was prepared for the distribution of the vaccine. One of our States has a population of no more than 150,000 people, and another of our States, with 16 million people, has a population that is greater than the population of Canada. Although there is that great difference in the population in various States of the Union, the basic principles of government within those States do not differ at all.

With respect to what the distinguished minority leader said about the polio sea-

son, it is true that the polio season during the spring prevails more in the southern area of our country than in the northern area. However, I should like to invite the attention of the distinguished minority leader to the fact that one of the States in which the children have suffered most from inoculation with serum made by the Cutter Laboratory is the State of Idaho, one of the most northerly States of the Union and just across the border from the Canadian Provinces of British Columbia and Alberta, in which the Canadian children have also received inoculations of vaccine. There is hardly any difference in climate between the northern section of the State of Idaho, on the one hand, and the extreme southern part of the Provinces of Alberta and British Columbia on the other hand. Most of the people in those Provinces live along the southern border of Canada, along the railway belt. Nevertheless, it is in Idaho that children have suffered most from the distribution of defective vaccine.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. Can the Senator from Oregon inform the Senate how many cc.'s have been used in Canada in the vaccination of Canadian children?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I do not know.

Mr. PURTELL. In other words, the Senator has no knowledge of the number of children in Canada who have been vaccinated?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I do not know the exact number of children who have been vaccinated in Canada.

Mr. PURTELL. Does the Senator know of any number of children in our country who have been denied the use of the vaccine because of the lack of a distribution plan?

Mr. NEUBERGER. In this country?

Mr. PURTELL. Yes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have seen repeated announcements to the effect that there will not be a sufficient quantity of vaccine to go around.

Mr. PURTELL. We are talking about a distribution problem, not a production problem.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It is obvious that there is a distribution problem, if there is not enough vaccine to go around.

Mr. PURTELL. Does the Senator feel that there will not be a sufficient amount to go around and that therefore a distribution problem is presented? Does he feel that there will not be enough vaccine to go around because of a distribution problem? Is not the problem one of making sure that the vaccine which will be distributed will be the type which will give immunity, or at least not cause polio?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is what our Government has not done. By its own admission, the vaccine which perhaps has caused polio in some children has already been distributed and has been used.

Mr. PURTELL. Will the Senator from Oregon tell me in what respect our Government has failed to act in that regard?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Of course I shall tell the Senator. Our Government has failed, in my opinion, to give the slight-

est support to a governmental control program that should have been applied to a serum as new as this is, before there was wholesale licensing of manufacturers to produce it.

Mr. PURTELL. Will the Senator inform the Senate whether he believes Canada is preparing its vaccine in a way which will guarantee that there will be complete immunization with its use?

Mr. NEUBERGER. When a vaccine is as new in its application and in its production as polio vaccine is, I should say that Canada, by licensing only one public laboratory at the University of Canada to produce it, and by testing each batch of vaccine, is following a wiser public policy than is being followed by this country in its wholesale granting of licenses to a vast and diverse number of private manufacturers.

Mr. PURTELL. Does the Senator from Oregon realize that there is not a vast and diverse number of manufacturers who are making the serum, but only six manufacturers? Does he not further realize that in a Nation the size of the United States, with a population of 163 million people, not 14 million, as is the case with Canada, it would be many months before children in the first to third grades of our schools could be inoculated if the manufacture of the serum were limited to one producer?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I will say that if tests of the serum were necessary in 1954, similar tests should have been made in 1955. Such tests were not made in 1955. There has been entirely too much “on again, off again” in connection with this whole subject. First the vaccine is distributed, then it is recalled. Physicians are advised to give the shots, then they are advised not to give the shots.

Mr. PURTELL. Is the Senator advising the Senate that Canada has a better way, a surer way, and that we lack the knowledge Canada possesses, which would enable us to go forward in a like manner?

Mr. NEUBERGER. We do not lack the knowledge. Our scientists have the knowledge. What we have lacked is a governmental program to provide for the testing of all the vaccine used, and a governmental program to see to it that the first batches available go only to those children in the most susceptible age brackets and to pregnant mothers—

Mr. PURTELL. Does the Senator from Oregon realize that the National Foundation has an order for 18 million cc's of the Salk vaccine?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does the Senator from Connecticut doubt the statements appearing in the press and magazines of the United States? For example, in Time magazine, which is certainly partial to the administration, it is stated that in many instances the vaccine has gone not to doctors who have patients who are most susceptible, but to the doctors who have the most business with the drug houses.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Can the Senator refer the Senate to any material which upholds the statement he has just made?



Mr. NEUBERGER. I asked the Senator from Connecticut if he had seen the statement made in Time magazine and if he doubted it.

Mr. ALLOTT. I doubt it.

Mr. PURTELL. I have not seen the statement, and I am not in the habit of either denying or confirming statements which I have not read.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am quoting to the Senator a statement appearing in Time magazine, a magazine which is very partial to this administration, that drug houses are distributing vaccine to doctors of their own choosing, rather than to those most entitled to receive it. If that statement is incorrect, I should be very happy to know it, because I think the national welfare is the most important consideration.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a moment?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. Did the Senator take the time to check to see whether the statement was or was not correct before quoting it in the Senate of the United States?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I presumed that if Time magazine, which is so friendly to the administration, makes a statement of that kind, it must have checked it. Does the Senator doubt that drug manufacturing firms are producing vaccine which, unfortunately, has been defective, and that it is going to doctors to whom they wish to sell it?

Mr. PURTELL. I doubt it. Eighteen million cc.'s of vaccine have been ordered by and will be delivered to the foundation.

Mr. ALLOTT. Does the Senator from Oregon know that there have been no deliveries since April 21?

Mr. NEUBERGER. If that be true, I am very glad of it. During the period between the announcement of the discovery of the vaccine and April 21, there was strong protest on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere because of the completely chaotic situation which prevailed in those weeks. If what was being done up to April 21 was all right, why was it necessary to stop it?

Some of us may remember, Mr. President, a phrase President Eisenhower used in trying to illuminate the progressive moderation, or the dynamic conservatism, supposedly guiding the policies of his administration. As I recall, President Eisenhower said that he was a conservative in financial affairs, but a liberal in human affairs. Those are fine phrases, Mr. President. But phrases alone will not guide a great Nation. Deeds, too, are essential. In the crisis of the Salk vaccine, the national administration has tried to substitute words for deeds.

This is particularly distressing when we consider that, across the frontier to the north, our closest neighboring land, the Dominion of Canada, has put into effect a program for governing the distribution and the manufacture of antipolio vaccine in the interest and welfare of every Canadian child and parent. Deeds speak louder than words. When will the Eisenhower administration fol-

low Canada's constructive leadership in this vital field of child health?

Mr. President, I wish to say, in conclusion, that I was much interested in the question asked me by the junior Senator from Colorado. I want to ask if the policy followed by the administration prior to April 21 was a wise one, why did the administration change its policy on April 21? It seems to me that April 21, 1955, was not the time to be ready with a program, but that last fall, perhaps, when the news of the Salk vaccine was available to the Departments of Health of both Canada and the United States, was the time to be ready with a program. The Canadian Minister pointed out that Canada was getting ready in the fall of 1954. If we have any program at all it dates only from April 21, 1955, which is certainly a vastly important time to the parents and children of the United States.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. NEUBERGER subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to comment very briefly on the colloquy I had this afternoon with several Members across the aisle on the question of the distribution of the Salk antipolio vaccine. During that discussion I was citing the program worked out by the Department of Health and Welfare, of the Government of Canada, for an orderly production, testing, and distribution of the Salk vaccine in that great nation across the border to the north. During the discussion, several Members across the aisle took exception to my statement that the Salk vaccine had been distributed by drug houses in the United States not necessarily to doctors who have patients who are children, and who thus are most susceptible to polio, but to doctors who have favorable relationships with those drug companies.

Since the discussion occurred, I have had an opportunity to check with the Library of Congress; and at this time I should like to quote exactly from several issues of Time magazine, and from the New York Times.

The following is an exact quotation from the issue of Time magazine for May 2, 1955; and the article from which I shall quote discussed the production and distribution of the Salk vaccine:

The situation was further complicated when, weeks ago, "detail men" for drug companies called on doctors and asked how much vaccine they wanted. How much they actually got depended less on how far ahead the company was with its production program than on how the salesmen liked individual doctors.

Mr. President, if that statement in Time magazine was not accurate—and the Senator from Connecticut said he doubted its accuracy—then it seems to me that a serious charge of that nature should have been denied at the time, which was May 2, either by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, or by the six drug companies which have been licensed to produce the Salk vaccine. That was a serious statement in a nationally circulated magazine.

It is passing strange, indeed, that members of the political party representing the administration have waited until May 19—more than 2 weeks later—to

deny that charge, if indeed the charge was inaccurate.

The issue of Time magazine for May 9, 1955, carried an article entitled "Vaccine Gray Market." I shall not read into the RECORD or quote the entire article; but one of the statements in the article, which is about the Salk vaccine, reads as follows—and I am now quoting from the article in Time magazine:

Moreover, 80 packages had been handed out as largesse to employees of the drug houses and their friends and relatives.

Mr. President, that was over 1 week ago. If packages of the Salk vaccine are being given out as "booty" to persons who work for the drug houses and their personal friends and favorites, that is also, indeed, a serious charge; and if the charge, as published in Time magazine, is not true, why was the charge never denied by the proper Government department and by the drug houses?

Perhaps the Members of the Senate remember when the public first learned, in the news, of the defective vaccine from the Cutter Laboratory. I have before me a clipping from the New York Times, and the headline reads as follows:

#### MISUSE OF VACCINE LAID TO FIVE DOCTORS

The article in the New York Times goes on to point out that a number of adults in the city of New York received inoculations of the antipolio vaccine, although everyone knows that children are infinitely more susceptible to the disease, and therefore are far more entitled to receive the "shots."

Mr. President, let me say that these are not pleasant things to relate. For the past week, I have been communicating with Canadian officials, in an effort to learn how Canada has handled the program, so that perhaps our country can benefit by Canada's example and by studying what Canada has done.

I regret that the Members across the aisle doubted what I said in reference to the lack of a program in the United States. They questioned my comments about the fact that in this country the vaccine had gone to doctors favored by the drug companies, rather than to doctors with the patients who are the most susceptible to the disease.

All I can say in conclusion, Mr. President, is that perhaps these magazines and newspapers may have been in error—although they are among the leading publications in the country—but if they were in error in what they printed, that should have been pointed out at the time of publication, and not today, on the floor of the Senate, a considerable number of weeks later.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, particularly those Members who desire to make their plans for today, I should like to announce that for the remainder of the evening the plan is to consider 4 or 5 bills on the calendar which have been previously cleared with the minority leader, and which the Senate has been informed were expected to be considered when action was concluded on the joint

resolution which was passed earlier in the afternoon.

No rollcalls are expected, Mr. President. I do not think there is any thing controversial in the measures to be considered.

It is hoped to have the road bill, S. 1048, made the unfinished business, to have just general discussion of it on Friday, then recess until Monday, and have further discussion of the road bill on Monday. Under the agreement reached today, action on the President's veto of the postal pay bill will be taken on Tuesday, and we shall then proceed with the road bill as far as possible.

Mr. President, I now desire to make a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

#### IMPROVEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE FEDERAL PROPERTY AND SERVICES ACT OF 1949

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 355, House bill 3322, and I call the attention of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] to the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3322) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, so as to improve the administration of the program for the utilization of surplus property for educational and public-health purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3322) which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to insert "(a)"; in line 8, after the word "following", to strike out "No property shall be transferred under this subsection until the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has received from an appropriate State agency or official a certification that such property is usable and needed for educational or public health purposes in the State."; on page 2, after line 7, to insert:

(b) Paragraph (2) of section 203 (j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentence: "No property shall be transferred (except surplus property donated in conformity with paragraph (3) of this subsection), until the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has received from an appropriate State agency or official a certification that such property is usable and needed for educational or public health purposes in the State, and no property shall be transferred pursuant to this paragraph until the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has determined that such agency or official has conformed to minimum standards of operation prescribed by the Secretary for the disposal of surplus property."

On page 3, line 4, after the word "under", to insert "paragraph (2) of"; on page 4, line 4, after the word "for",

to strike out "educational purposes or" and insert "educational"; in line 5, after the word "health", to insert "or memorial"; in line 13, after the word "restriction", to insert "which occurred prior to the enactment of this act"; in line 14, after the word "is", to insert "pending at the time of, or"; on page 5, line 1, after the word "if", to insert "(1) such violation occurred prior to the expiration of such one-year period and (2)"; in line 3, after the word "is", to insert "pending at the time of enactment of this Act or is"; in line 4, after the word "commenced", to strike out "within" and insert "not later than"; in line 16, after the word "property", to strike out "donated" and insert "disposed of"; in line 21, after the word "donated", to insert "or disposed of", and after line 22 to insert:

Sec. 6. (a) Section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by striking out the words "Federal Security Administrator" and "Federal Security Agency" wherever they appear in subsection (j) or (k) of such section, and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare", and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare", respectively.

(b) Section 203 of such act, as amended by this act, is further amended (1) by striking out in paragraph (1) of subsection (j) thereof the words "the States, Territories, and possessions" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "any State", and (2) by adding at the end of such subsection the following new paragraph:

"(5) The term 'State', as used in this subsection, includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Territories and possessions of the United States."

(c) Clause (D) of paragraph (1) of subsection (k) of section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by inserting after "District of Columbia" a comma and the words "the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, H. R. 3322, which was passed by the House, came to the Senate and was considered by the Committee on Government Operations, which made some minor amendments to the bill.

The bill provides that surplus personal property carried in a working capital or similar fund in any Federal agency is to be considered for donation to educational or health institutions on the same basis as surplus personal property which is not carried in such a fund. The purpose of the bill is to make clear that the Congress does not intend, and has never intended, to exempt surplus personal property from the donation program merely because it is carried in a working capital fund managed by the Department of Defense or any other agency, regardless of the time it was procured or the accounting classification under which procured or carried on the books of the owning agency.

Mr. President, there has been quite a loophole in the act affecting surplus property, which is intended, under existing law, to be made available for health and educational purposes. The purpose of the bill is to close that loophole and to make all Government personal property which may become sur-

plus available for donation, where suitable, for educational or health uses, by having the property designated as surplus, rather than sold and disposed of by the agency wherein the excess or surplus arises.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments, and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

#### AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 356, Senate bill 1805, amending the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1805) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, bills similar to the pending bill have previously been passed twice by the Senate.

The bill provides the Congress with the machinery necessary to enable it to meet its constitutional responsibilities in connection with the appropriation of funds required for the conduct of the Federal Government.

I may say that the bill seeks to accomplish this objective by establishing a Joint Committee on the Budget, composed of Members of the Senate and the House Appropriations Committees, which would assist the Congress in exercising adequate control over the expenditure of public funds by the executive branch of the Government.

In 1952 a similar bill, in substantially the form of the pending bill, was passed by the Senate by a vote of 55 to 8, but failed of passage in the House. Thereafter, the bill was reintroduced in the 83d Congress, as Senate bill 833; and at that time it was cosponsored by 54 Members of the Senate. In that Congress the bill was passed unanimously by the Senate, but likewise failed of passage in the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1805) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

#### "JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

"SEC. 138. (a) There is hereby created a joint service committee, to be known as the



Joint Committee on the Budget (hereinafter in this section called the 'joint committee') and to be composed of 14 members as follows:

"(1) Seven Members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, 4 from the majority party and 3 from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee; and

"(2) Seven Members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, 4 from the majority party and 3 from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee.

"(b) No person shall continue to serve as a member of the joint committee after he has ceased to be a member of the committee from which he was chosen, except that the members chosen by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives who have been reelected to the House of Representatives may continue to serve as members of the joint committee notwithstanding the expiration of the Congress. A vacancy in the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection, except that (1) in case of a vacancy during an adjournment or recess of Congress for a period of more than 2 weeks, the members of the joint committee who are members of the committee entitled to fill such vacancy may designate a member of such committee to serve until his successor is chosen by such committee, and (2) in the case of a vacancy after the expiration of a Congress which would be filled from the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, the members of such committee who are continuing to serve as members of the joint committee, may designate a person who, immediately prior to such expiration, was a member of such committee and who is reelected to the House of Representatives, to serve until his successor is chosen by such committee.

"(c) The joint committee shall elect a chairman and vice chairman from among its members at the first regular meeting of each session: *Provided, however,* That during even years the chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the House of Representatives and the vice chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the Senate, and during odd years the chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the Senate and the vice chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the House of Representatives.

"(d) The joint committee may make such rules respecting its organization and procedures as it deems necessary: *Provided, however,* That no measure or recommendation shall be reported from the joint committee unless a majority of the committee assent.

"(e) It shall be the duty of the joint committee—

"(1) (A) to inform itself on all matters relating to the annual budget of the agencies of the United States Government, including analytical, investigative, audit, and other reports on Federal operations prepared by the General Accounting Office pursuant to section 312 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, the Government Corporation Control Act, and section 206 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and by other Federal agencies; (B) to provide the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate with such information on items contained in such budget, and the justifications submitted in support thereof, as may be necessary to enable said committees to give adequate consideration thereto; (C) to consider the President's messages on the state of the Union and the

Economic Report, to consider all information relating to estimated revenues, including revenue estimates of the Department of the Treasury and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to consider essential programs, and to consider changing economic conditions; and (D) to report to the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives and the Senate its findings with respect to budget estimates and revisions in appropriations required to hold expenditures to the minimum consistent with the requirements of Government operations and national security;

"(2) to recommend to the appropriate standing committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate such changes in existing laws as may effect greater efficiency and economy in government;

"(3) to make such reports and recommendations to any standing committee of either House of Congress or any subcommittee thereof on matters within the jurisdiction of such standing committee relating to deviations from basic legislative authorization, or to appropriations approved by Congress which are not consistent with such basic legislative authorization, or to cutbacks in previously authorized programs which require appropriations, as may be deemed necessary or advisable by the joint committee, or as may be requested by any standing committee of either House of Congress or by any subcommittee thereof;

"(4) to report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate at the beginning of each regular session of the Congress the total estimated costs of all programs and projects authorized by the Congress, together with estimated costs of such programs and projects during the fiscal year under way, the ensuing fiscal year, and subsequent fiscal years, and to make such interim reports as may be deemed advisable.

"(f) The joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act anywhere within or without the District of Columbia whether the Congress is in session or has adjourned or is in recess; to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems necessary to carry out its functions within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpoenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192-194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpoena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

"(g) The joint committee shall have a staff director, an associate staff director, and such other professional, technical, clerical, and other employees, temporary or permanent, as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the joint committee. Such employees shall be employed without regard to the civil-service laws, and their compensation shall be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the party of which the chairman of the joint committee is a member, and the associate staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the opposition party. No person shall be employed by the joint committee unless the members appointing him have favorably considered the data with respect to him submitted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation after a thorough investigation of his loyalty and security.

"(h) The joint committee shall make available members of its staff to assist the staffs

of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and of the Senate and the several subcommittees thereof during the periods when appropriation bills are pending.

"(i) Professional and technical employees of the joint committee, upon the written authority of the chairman or vice chairman, shall have the right to examine the fiscal books, documents, papers, and reports of any agency of the United States Government within or without the District of Columbia, and data related to proposed appropriations incorporated in the annual budget transmitted by the President.

"(j) The annual budget of the United States shall henceforth include a special analysis of all active long-term construction and development programs and projects authorized by the Congress, showing for each the total estimated cost, and the actual or estimated expenditures during prior fiscal years, the current fiscal year, the ensuing fiscal year, and subsequent fiscal years. All grant-in-aid programs shall be included in this analysis, in a separate grouping, showing under the heading 'Subsequent Fiscal Years' for grants of indefinite duration the estimated annual cost for a 10-year period.

"(k) Qualified members of the staff of the Bureau of the Budget shall, at the request of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives or the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, be assigned to attend executive sessions of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committees and to explain the content and basis of proposed appropriations.

"(l) The Comptroller General of the United States shall, at the request of the chairman of the Joint Committee on the Budget, make such investigations and reports with respect to any agency as will enable such joint committee to give adequate consideration to items relating to such agency which are contained in the budget as submitted by the President, and the justifications submitted in support thereof; and, for this purpose, the Comptroller General is authorized to employ technical and professional personnel without regard to the civil-service laws, rules, or regulations, and fix their compensation without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(m) When used in this section, the term 'agency' means any executive department, commission, council, independent establishment, Government corporation, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government. Such term includes the Comptroller General of the United States and the General Accounting Office, and includes any and all parts of the municipal government of the District of Columbia except the courts thereof.

"(n) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section. Appropriations for the expenses of the joint committee shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman."

SEC. 2. Effective at the beginning of the second regular session of the 84th Congress, section 133 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) (1) All bills and joint resolutions authorizing appropriations reported from committees of the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be accompanied by reports in writing, which shall be printed; and there shall be included in each such report or in an accompanying document an estimate from the department or other agency of the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the Government primarily concerned of the probable cost of carrying out the legislation proposed in such bill or

resolution over the first 5-year period of its operation or over the period of its operation if such legislation will be effective for less than 5 years. If the chairman of the committee determines that no existing department or agency is primarily concerned with the legislation, the estimate shall be made by the Bureau of the Budget.

"(2) Estimates received from departments or agencies under this subsection may be submitted by the committees to the Bureau of the Budget for review, and such reviews, when practicable, shall be included in the reports or accompanying documents before said bills and joint resolutions are reported.

"(3) The Joint Committee on the Budget shall maintain compilations of all such estimates, and semiannually shall print those compilations (together with any comment of the Bureau of the Budget) for the information of the Congress."

Sec. 3. Section 139 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) The Joint Committee on the Budget is authorized to recommend that joint hearings be held by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and of subcommittees thereof; but such joint hearings shall not affect the power of the respective committees, and of subcommittees thereof, to conduct separate additional committee hearings, and shall not affect the independence of committee deliberations and decision. The chairman of each such joint hearing shall be the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, or of the appropriate subcommittee thereof, of the House in which the bill is pending at the time of the hearing, and the vice chairman shall be the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the other House, or of the appropriate subcommittee thereof."

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President—

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). The Senator from Utah.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 358, Senate Resolution 102; and if the Senator from Utah will yield, since he has been recognized, I should like to make that motion and have the resolution brought before the Senate.

Mr. WATKINS. What is the resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The resolution relates to conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the George D. Emery Co.

Mr. WATKINS. The resolution has no relationship to the Kempner estate, has it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No, none whatever, nor to the State of Utah, nor to any particular church, nor to any particular day of the month. The resolution is simply a private resolution coming from the Senator's own committee.

Mr. WATKINS. I wished to be sure the resolution came from the Judiciary Committee.

Very well, Mr. President; I yield.

#### GEORGE D. EMERY CO.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to

the consideration of Calendar No. 358, Senate Resolution 102, to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims in connection with the claim of the George D. Emery Co.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 102) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the George D. Emery Co.

Mr. President, the purpose of the resolution is to refer the bill (S. 427) for the relief of the Geo. D. Emery Co., to the Court of Claims. The claim involves difficult questions of fact and law, including compensation for services performed by this company on behalf of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other Government agencies, in connection with establishing an abaca plantation in Ecuador, in accordance with the Abaca Production Act of 1950—Public Law 683, 81st Congress.

The procedure involves a hearing by the Court, with a report back to Congress, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States.

Mr. President, I am informed by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, from which this measure comes, that this formula has been used many times by the Congress in connection with complex claims brought to the attention of the committee.

It is the intent of the Judiciary Committee that the Court of Claims consider only equitable or legal rights to unrecovered expenses, not any claim to profits.

Mr. President, I ask for a vote on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution (S. Res. 102) was agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the bill (S. 427) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Geo. D. Emery Co.," now pending in the Senate, together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same, in accordance with the provisions of said sections, and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimants.

#### THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, as a representative of the arid West, which has been helped immeasurably by the Bureau of Reclamation in the development of its limited water resources, I am gratified that Commissioner of Reclamation W. A. Drexler has come out in a frank and forthright statement to

set the record straight on the soundness of the Colorado River storage project and the reclamation program generally.

Commissioner Drexler has shown great forbearance and patience in keeping silent during the past several months when individuals and propaganda-pressure groups have been directing one of the most unfair and untruthful attacks ever unleashed at a public-works program.

Commissioner Drexler is a highly respected engineer who participated in planning and construction of Hoover Dam, Shasta Dam, and other great engineering works. His statement will carry great weight among engineering people and reasonable people who respect fair play and consideration of all the facts.

In view of the importance of giving these facts on the Colorado River storage project and the Government's reclamation program a public airing to counteract some of the untruthful propaganda which is being poured out by people who seek to prevent water development in the arid West, I hereby request unanimous consent to have Mr. Drexler's statement of May 13, 1955, printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although I shall not object—I desire to point out to my good friend the Senator from Utah that I do not believe I took an unreasonable position regarding the proposed Colorado storage project legislation; nor do I believe that the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who now occupies the chair, took an unreasonable position on the measure.

Let me say to the Senator from Utah that reasonable men may disagree about questions which are subject to debate, and I do not assert that my friend the Senator from Utah should be classified as unreasonable.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I did not know that the Senator from California thought I was referring to him. I do not know that the statement which I mentioned refers to him.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend.

Mr. WATKINS. However, if Mr. Drexler's statement applies to the Senator from California rather than to Mr. Moley and the magazine Newsweek, it will have to apply; I cannot help it.

Let me say I have no disrespect for the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who now is presiding over the Senate. However, I wish to have the statement to which I have referred printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Commissioner of Reclamation W. A. Drexler said today that critics are attempting, by unwarranted distortion and omission of facts, to discredit and bring to a halt efforts to help meet the West's critical water shortages.

His statement follows:  
"The Bureau of Reclamation expects and welcomes thoughtful and constructive criticism which is based on solid facts and knowl-



edge of what has been accomplished in the past half century and what is proposed for the future.

"However, it is time to take a close look at the indiscriminate attack of those critics who are attempting, by every means at their command, to destroy public confidence in our efforts to assist the arid Western States in meeting their water needs. The attacks are currently centering on the proposed upper Colorado River storage project which was worked out under the terms of the Colorado River compact and in cooperation between the Federal Government and the States of Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico, to enable the States to utilize their apportioned share of Colorado River water. These critics are much less careful in their handling of the facts than those individuals and groups who have opposed virtually every major project ever undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation.

"Yet, who is there today who will challenge the worth of such facilities as the lower Colorado River development, Hoover Dam, Imperial Valley, the Central Valley project, Grand Coulee Dam, Boise Valley, Salt River project, or the Colorado Big Thompson project.

"Leslie A. Miller, who is a former governor of Wyoming and who should be aware of the importance of reclamation work in that State as well as elsewhere in the West, has repeatedly cited the increased cost of the Colorado-Big Thompson project as a reason it should not have been built and why other projects, such as the upper Colorado River storage project, should not be undertaken.

"Let Mr. Miller repeat his accusations, as made in the Reader's Digest and other periodicals, in front of any group of Colorado farmers who were saved from almost total drought disaster last summer by the successful functioning of this project. Or let him put his accusation in proper perspective by quoting the correct original estimate of costs and then point out that World War II intervened between the time this estimate was given and the time the bulk of the project was constructed. He conveniently neglected to mention the 250 percent increase in the construction cost index during the 18 years between authorization and completion of construction.

"Like Raymond A. Moley, in his multitudinous dissections of reclamation in Newsweek magazine, Mr. Miller neglects to mention that reclamation, unlike other water resources work undertaken by the Federal Government, is on a hard-cash repayment basis. They choose to ignore the fact that out of a total reclamation expenditure of \$2,850,146,288 in the last half century, \$577,822,640 has been repaid and that \$60 million is flowing into the Treasury annually at the present time. This includes interest on the Federal investment in hydroelectric and municipal water facilities.

"It should be remembered that more than half of Reclamation's annual appropriation is now coming from the revolving Reclamation Fund which was established by the Congress by the Reclamation Act of 1902. This same Congress established the principle that funds for irrigation development should be loaned without interest as a means of advancing the national economy. The same principle has been followed by every Congress since 1902.

"The facts are that this investment is paying off, not only in the cash repayment to the Treasury but in its positive contributions to the national economy and well-being.

"The records are replete with instances of reclamation project areas pouring into the Federal Treasury in income taxes alone, more each year than the total Federal investment in project facilities. Buying power of more than \$750 million annually is contained in the crops the farmers take from

their irrigated fields on Federal reclamation projects.

"The Federal Government, over the years, has spent millions and billions for flood control, navigation, transportation subsidies, drought relief, crop support, and crop insurance without expectation or hope of reimbursement. But these areas of disaster continue to plague us while the irrigated oases in the arid West remain solid units of stabilized agricultural production. I have no quarrel with the Federal policy, but why pick on western irrigation?

"It was interesting to note in the Saturday Evening Post of April 30, an editorial supporting an increased appropriation of \$18 million for a channel-deepening project in the Delaware River which would benefit particularly the United States Steel Corp. by permitting oceangoing ore boats to unload at docks for the new Fairless plant. Will this investment be paid back by local beneficiaries? The Saturday Evening Post editorial is proposing a writeoff of this local harbor improvement in the Delaware River. Reclamation investments will be returned to the Treasury. The West only asks for a loan and a reasonable time to repay.

"Specific criticism of the proposed upper Colorado River storage project by Mr. Miller, Mr. Moley, et al., concerns three main points: (1) An incredible bill from the non-payment of interest on irrigation features of the project; (2) compounding of the crop surplus problem by the addition of new irrigated lands; (3) the construction of Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument would be an opening wedge in the desecration of our national park system.

"Mr. Moley's description of an incredible bill for interest is just that—totally incredible. The facts are that 63½ percent of costs are chargeable to power and municipal and industrial water and will be repaid with interest at 2½ percent which is the same interest paid by the United States Treasury.

"The upper Colorado River project report, as approved by the Secretary of the Interior, proposes an expenditure of about \$800 million for irrigation phases of the project. These funds will be spent over a period of more than 25 years and repayment on each irrigation unit will start soon after it is completed. A few years are allowed before repayment begins to permit the farmer to establish himself on the land.

"Current national troubles with crop surpluses have been used to becloud the reclamation picture and particularly to delay the authorization of several projects which are now before Congress. Completely ignored by the critics is the fact that most products of western irrigated farms are not under price support or acreage control and are not surplus. Seventy-five percent of land irrigated by the upper Colorado River projects would be for livestock production.

"More important in the agricultural production picture is the long-range population estimate. The Bureau of the Census fixes our national population at 200 million in 1975. Byron T. Shaw, Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service in the Department of Agriculture, is authority for the statement that, 'If the average American is to continue to have as much meat to eat as he did last year, all acreage that is currently idle will have to be put back to work by 1950. By 1975, even if all marginal lands are used, there might be a deficit of more than 100 million acres. To meet this, livestock production alone will have to be doubled on the land at hand.' Few new lands in the upper Colorado River Basin would receive water before 1975 if the project was authorized tomorrow.

"The Bureau of Reclamation makes no pretense of expecting to solve this approaching national food-production crisis by the construction of reclamation projects alone. We believe that in the decades ahead there

will be a continued increase in per acre production and also in total acreage under production, both by irrigation and the drainage of present swampland. However, at the present time, according to Department of Agriculture statistics, we are fighting a losing battle to maintain our present cultivated acreage.

"Urban inroads are claiming more acreage than we are placing in production by irrigation. We must plan now for the future. To do otherwise would be criminally shortsighted.

"The so-called invasion of national parks should be considered in the light of a careful documentation of dam sites and reservoir areas withdrawn specifically for power and reclamation purposes along the Green and Yampa Rivers and events leading to the subsequent enlargement of Dinosaur National Monument to encompass the same area by Presidential order on July 14, 1938.

"One reclamation and 10 power-site withdrawals (land and dam sites set aside by Federal action) were made along these rivers between 1904 and 1925 covering, among other areas, the Echo Park and Split Mountain dam and reservoir sites. The National Park Service, by letter dated August 9, 1934, to the Federal Power Commission, observed that the proposed proclamation (to enlarge Dinosaur Monument) would protect all existing rights, and inquired as to whether the Echo Park and Blue Mountain sites might be released. The Federal Power Commission replied on December 13, 1934, that the Commission believes that the public interest in this major power resource is too great to permit its impairment by voluntary relinquishment of two units in the center of the scheme. The Commission will not object, however, to the creation of the monument if the proclamation contains a specific provision that power development under the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act will be permitted."

"The request was renewed in a letter dated November 6, 1935, over the signature of Harold L. Ickes, then Secretary of the Interior. The Federal Power Commission again rejected the request on January 6, 1936, quoting the identical language of the previous letter to the National Park Service. The Presidential proclamation of 1938 made the enlarged Dinosaur National Monument subject to all existing rights. Therefore, it would appear that there is actually no invasion of the national park system but merely the exercise of a previously established reservation. The original 80-acre Dinosaur Monument contains all known fossils and is 20 miles downstream from any proposed reservoir. It would not be disturbed.

"Despite this previous withdrawal of the Echo Park and other multipurpose dam sites for reclamation purposes, we are not anxious to construct a reclamation structure in this area if alternate sites are feasible. Conclusive investigations over 20 years have ruled out any of the suggested alternates because they would provide less storage space, involve greater evaporation losses and reduce the power output from the upper Colorado Basin system. The large reservoir storage is essential to hold floodwaters in years of excess runoff for use in drier years and seasons of low-river flow. Maximum power output is essential because power revenue will repay the bulk of project costs.

"Development and conservation of a maximum supply of water and power is essential to the continued economic growth of the area. There is and will continue to be a market for the 6-mill power which will be produced. All 10 private utility companies serving the area have testified before the committees of Congress that they would take all available power at the 6-mill rate. Preference agencies have also expressed a need for the power output.

"Reclamation engineers have established a worldwide reputation in water conservation by the investigation, design, construction, and operation of the numerous reclamation projects which now dot the western scene. We do not take lightly the challenge to our integrity by those critics who prefer the scattergun attack to a careful adherence to the facts."

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, both Mr. Dexheimer's statement and the Tribune editorial are clear and forthright, and need no explanation. In view of the liberties which have been and are being taken with the truth in regard to the reclamation program, it is both timely and refreshing to have the Reclamation Commissioner and a great newspaper speak out so firmly in defense of accuracy and fair play.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial referred to, which was published in the Salt Lake Tribune on Sunday, May 15, 1955, printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ANSWERING MOLEY-MILLER PROPAGANDA BLAST "Why pick on western irrigation?"

With this question, Reclamation Commissioner Wilbur A. Dexheimer last week-end pointed out a brilliant defense of the upper Colorado River project against the published attacks of ex-New Dealers Leslie A. Moley, of Cheyenne, and Raymond A. Moley, Newsweek columnist.

Mr. Dexheimer is no wild-eyed promoter of big dams. His record is one of staunch conservatism. Before a reclamation project is submitted to Congress he insists that its engineering and economic feasibility be proved. The Bureau of Reclamation has refused to go ahead on a number of projects in recent years, despite terrific local pressure, because of doubts as to feasibility.

Mr. Dexheimer pulled the rug out from under the Moley-Miller team by pointing out that their attacks on economic feasibility of the upper Colorado project fail to give credit for reimbursable features of reclamation loans or the corollary benefits in increased taxes and new markets. And he pointed out that some enemies of reclamation projects are thumping for huge harbor and dredging projects which would return not a cent directly to the taxpayer, notably the proposed \$18 million Delaware River Channel deepening project.

Unlike many other water resources projects undertaken by the Federal Government, reclamation is on a hard cash repayment basis. Of the \$2,850,146,238 expended for reclamation in the last half century, \$577,822,640 has been repaid and \$60 million is flowing back into the treasury each year.

Other studies show that reclamation projects will repay more than construction costs over the years through increased tax yields. Some areas developed through reclamation in 20 years have paid \$2.75 into the Federal Treasury in taxes for every dollar spent on construction.

Glib opponents of reclamation—or their ghost writers—are constantly warning taxpayers as to their share of the total cost of such projects as the upper Colorado. Actually, sound studies show the upper Colorado project would be self-liquidating. Moreover it would open up vast storehouses of raw materials and provide job opportunities for many people. It would accelerate the decentralization of industry and create new wealth markets and defensive materials for all the country.

The attack on the economic and engineering feasibility of the upper Colorado pro-

gram has gained momentum since the phony cries of "national park invasion" failed to block the program. Facts and figures showing that both Federal water and power withdrawals antedated extension of the national monument to include Echo Park have greatly weakened the invasion arguments. Mr. Dexheimer likened Echo Park's relation to the overall project to one wheel of a wagon. It might still run without the wheel but not very far.

The calamity howlers will continue to try to stir up opposition throughout the country, just as they did before the building of Hoover Dam, the Colorado-Big Thompson, and other western reclamation projects. But it was one of the most violent of the critics who, in a more temperate article quoted a western hydrologist as giving the "last word" on the matter of water costs: "There is no price for water and so there can be no ceiling price."

#### EXTENDING TITLE II, FIRST WAR POWERS ACT, 1941

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 359, House bill 4052, which would continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4052) to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this bill is part of legislative program of the Department of Defense for 1955, and was introduced at that Department's request. Its purpose is to extend for 2 years, or until June 30, 1957, title II of the First War Powers Act. The existing law provides that the extension may be terminated at any time by concurrent resolution of the Congress, and this proposal would in no way change that provision.

The basic purpose of the statute is to permit the President to authorize any department or agency of the Government exercising functions in connection with the prosecution of the national defense effort to enter into contracts and into amendments of modifications of contracts, and to make advance, progress, and other payments thereon, without regard to the provisions of law relating to the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts, whenever he deems such action would facilitate the national defense, subject, however, to certain safeguards set forth in title II.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 4052) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### SALE OF CERTAIN SHIPS TO CITI- ZENS OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to

the consideration of Calendar No. 362, Senate Joint Resolution 67.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 67) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines, to provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Philippines, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, on page 1, line 8, after the numerals "1946," to strike out "two" and insert "five"; on page 2, line 1, after the colon, to insert "*Carrick Bend, Masthead Knot, Snug Hitch*"; in line 3, after the colon, to strike out "*Provided, That with respect to vessels under charter on the date of enactment of this act, and which have been continuously under charter for a period of 5 years or more, there shall be subtracted from the sales price, as depreciation, \$95.05 per day per vessel for the period beginning July 1, 1954, and ending with the date of execution of the contract of sale of the respective vessel*" and insert in lieu thereof "*Provided, That with respect to each of the said vessels one-half of the charter line paid to the United States shall be subtracted from the sales price as additional depreciation for the period beginning July 1, 1954, and ending with the date of execution of the contract of sale of the respective vessel: And provided further, That the Secretary of Commerce after consultation with the National Advisory Council in International Monetary and Financial Problems, shall fix the terms of payment on unpaid balances, which terms shall in no event be more favorable than the terms applicable in the case of sales to citizens of the United States.*" "so as to make the joint resolution read:

*Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 14 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (Public Law 321, 79th Cong.), as amended, or any other provision of law, the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed to sell to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines in accordance with the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, five vessels named herein: Carrick Bend, Masthead Knot, Snug Hitch, Boat-swains Hitch, and Turks Head, which at present are in the Philippines: Provided, That with respect to each of the said vessels one-half of the charter line paid to the United States shall be subtracted from the sales price as additional depreciation for the period beginning July 1, 1954, and ending with the date of execution of the contract of sale of the respective vessel: And provided further, That the Secretary of Commerce after consultation with the National Advisory Council in International Monetary and Financial Problems, shall fix the terms of payment on unpaid balances, which terms shall in no event be more favorable than the terms applicable in the case of sales to citizens of the United States.*

In determining the order of preference between applicants for the purchase of such



vessels, first preference shall be given to the applicants who are charterers of such vessels under the terms of the aforesaid act of April 30, 1946, as amended, at the time of making application to purchase vessels under the terms of this act; second preference shall be given to applicants who suffered losses of interisland tonnage in the interests of the Allied war effort: *Provided*, That applications for the purchase of said vessels are received by the Secretary of Commerce within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act.

Except with the prior approval of the Secretary of Commerce, any vessel sold under this joint resolution shall, for a period of 10 years from the date of sale of the vessel, be operated only in the interisland commerce of the Philippines.

Delivery of the vessels for the purposes of sale shall be made at a port in the Philippines designated by the Secretary of Commerce.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the said vessels shall continue to operate in the Philippines under existing charters until such time as the agreements of sale are executed and deliveries of the vessels thereunder are accomplished.

For the purposes of this act, the term "citizen" includes any individual, corporation, partnership, association, or other form of business entity authorized to do business under the laws of the Republic of the Philippines.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the joint resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 67, as amended, would authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to sell in accordance with the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended, five vessels named in the resolution which are presently under charter to shipping companies in the Philippines. First preference between applicants for the purchase of the vessels would be given to the present charterers, the Philippine Steam Navigation Co.—charterers of the SS. *Boatswain Hitch* and the SS. *Turks Head*—and the Compania Maritima—charterers of the SS. *Carrick Bend*, the SS. *Masthead Knot*, and the SS. *Snug Hitch*. Second preference would be given to applicants who suffered losses of interisland tonnage in the interest of the Allied war effort. Applications for purchase must be received by the Secretary of Commerce within a year after enactment of the resolution.

In line with the views expressed by the conferees on Senate Joint Resolution 72, 83d Congress, 2d session, the joint resolution as amended would subtract from the sales price of each of the vessels one-half of the charter hire paid to the United States Government from July 1, 1954, to the date of execution of the contracts for each vessel. And, in line with the recommendation of the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary would be directed to fix the terms of payment on the unpaid balances, which terms shall in no event be more favorable than the terms applicable in the case of sales to citizens of the United States.

Unless the purchaser is given prior approval by the Secretary of Commerce, any vessel sold under this joint resolution must be operated only in the inter-

island commerce of the Philippines for a period of 10 years from the date of sale. The existing charters are authorized to be continued until such times as the vessels are sold and delivered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### EXPLORATION, LOCATION, AND ENTRY OF MINERAL LANDS WITHIN THE PAPAGO INDIAN RESERVATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 360, Senate bill 33.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 33) relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, while I am waiting for certain information, I shall make a brief explanation of the bill.

The purpose of S. 33 is to repeal the provisions of the Executive order of February 1, 1917, which created the Papago Indian Reservation, the act of February 21, 1931, the act of June 18, 1934, and the act of August 26, 1937, insofar as they refer to location and entry under the mining laws of lands within the Papago Reservation. The bill provides that all tribal lands within the reservation are withdrawn from all forms of exploration, location, and entry under the above laws, and that minerals underlying the reservation are made a part of the reservation to be held in trust by the United States for the Papago Indian Tribe.

The reservation includes 2,700,000 acres of which, according to the latest available figures—as of December 1953—only 12,360 acres are included in mining claims, and only approximately 3,600 acres have been covered by mineral patent. A savings clause preserves all valid rights established heretofore under the mineral laws, but the enactment of the bill will protect the Papago Indians from further diminution of their reservation. Recent accelerated uranium prospecting has further increased tribal

concern that the surface of large areas of land may later be lost to tribal utilization. The loss of further surface resources of the Papago Indian Reservation will increase the problem of administering Indian affairs on this reservation.

The committee believes that this reservation should be closed to all forms of mineral entry, that the Papago Tribe should be given fee title to the tribal lands, and that mining operations should be carried on under leases issued under the Tribal Leasing Act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347, 25 U. S. C. 396a-f) as provided in S. 33.

The author of the bill, the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], reported it from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I understand that he is detained from the Chamber. However, the report from the committee is unanimous, and I hope the bill may be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the provisions with respect to subjection of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation to exploration, location, and entry under the mining laws of the United States in the Executive order dated February 1, 1917, creating the Papago Indian Reservation, and in the third proviso in section 1 of the act of February 21, 1931 (46 Stat. 1202), and the provisions of subsection (b) (1) and (2) of the remainder, following the word "purposes," of subsection (b) (4) of section 3 of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984; 25 U. S. C. 461-479), as amended by the act of August 26, 1937 (50 Stat. 862, 863; 25 U. S. C. 463), are hereby repealed, all tribal lands within the Papago Indian Reservation are hereby withdrawn from all forms of exploration, location, and entry under such laws, the minerals underlying such lands are hereby made a part of the reservation to be held in trust by the United States for the Papago Indian Tribe, and such minerals shall be subject to lease for mining purposes pursuant to the provisions of the act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347): *Provided*, That the provisions of this act shall not be applicable to lands within the Papago Indian Reservation for which a mineral patent has heretofore been issued or to a claim that has been validly initiated before the date of this act and thereafter maintained under the mining laws of the United States.

SEC. 2. Section 6 of the act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347, 348; 25 U. S. C. 396f), is amended by deleting therefrom "the Papago Indian Reservation in Arizona."

#### FEDERAL AID ROAD CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am about to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 354, Senate bill 1048, a bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1911 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The bill was introduced by the able junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr.

GORE]. In accordance with the statement previously made to the Senate, I assure the Senate that no votes will be taken on this measure today or tomorrow, except upon the motion to proceed to consider the bill, and certainly none will be taken before Monday of next week.

I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1048.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1048) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments.

#### ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COST OF DEFENSE—FARM INCOME

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, under date of Friday, May 6, in the Washington Post and Times Herald, there was published a press story from the United Press, under the headline "Wilson Sees 3.5 Billions Arms Rise."

The article reads as follows:

##### WILSON SEES 3.5 BILLIONS ARMS RISE

Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson indicated yesterday that future annual defense appropriations may have to be \$3.5 billion more than the amount Congress is expected to provide for the year starting July 1.

Even with the "strict austerity" he is enforcing, Wilson said military spending will continue at the "high rate" of \$35 billion a year for a long time. The House Appropriations Committee yesterday approved appropriations of \$31.5 billion for the fiscal year starting July 1.

Wilson said when unspent funds carried over from the Korean war years are used up, "requests for new obligatory authority" will have to be increased to support the long-pull defense outlays.

He made the forecast in an annual report submitted to the President and sent by the White House to Congress. It covered the year which ended last June 30.

The report included these highlights:

Wilson cited guided missiles as the one area where deliveries and spending are rising.

Army Secretary Robert T. Stevens said there is "aggressive" research on weapons "to meet the threat of low altitude air attack and the possible danger of intercontinental missiles."

Air Secretary Harold E. Talbott said that hydrogen bomb training has been made part of the regular courses in Air Training Command and the Air Force Academy because of

the "rapidly growing demand" for personnel in the thermonuclear program.

Navy Secretary Charles S. Thomas dealt at length with the "startling strength" of the Russian navy and urged "very substantial" new United States shipbuilding. Otherwise, he said, "the day may not be too far distant when we shall find Soviet warships freely cruising in every ocean, bringing the Red flag into every port and lying with their guns and guided missiles off our very shores."

I call attention to the second paragraph of the article:

Wilson said when unspent funds carried over from the Korean war years are used up, "requests for new obligatory authority" will have to be increased to support the long-pull defense outlays.

Mr. President, it is interesting to note that the chief spokesman of the administration for the Department of Defense is belatedly saying to the American people that the administration has been able to reduce some of the defense appropriation requests because, Mr. Wilson says now, in 1955, when unspent funds carried over from the Korean war years are used up, requests for new obligatory authority will have to be increased to support the long-pull defense outlays.

I believe the facts are becoming ever more clear, namely, that the administration in many of these areas has lived on some borrowed time, if not on some borrowed capital, and has lived off the fat of more lush and profitable days.

I merely wanted to bring the matter to the attention of the Senate because when we examine the cash expenditures of this administration, we find that the situation is not any different than it has been during the past 10 years.

##### AGRICULTURAL INCOME

I should like to call attention to another item published in one of the newspapers. The headline of the article reads, "Farm Income Boost of 40 Percent Seen by 1975."

That headline would give one the impression that everything will be rosy in American agriculture in 1975. It predicts a 40 percent increase in agricultural income.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### FARM INCOME BOOST OF 40 PERCENT SEEN BY 1975

An Agriculture Department economist predicted yesterday that the needs of an expanding population may boost the income of American farmers at least 40 percent by 1975.

Nathan Koffsky, Chief of the Farm Income Branch, told a meeting of the Newspaper Farm Editors Association that the income of the Nation as a whole will be 50 to 60 percent higher 20 years from now if present trends continue.

To meet the needs of a larger population and its prospective larger buying power, he said, farmers must increase their output of food and fiber products at least 40 percent.

"I am not worried about the possibility of American farmers being able to meet this increased demand," he said. "But I can't say the same about some other areas of the world."

Koffsky said a general economic boom now in progress should do much to stabilize farm returns this year near last year's level.

He said consumers are spending 3 percent more than a year ago, a development which Koffsky said should contribute heavily toward halting a postwar decline in farm income.

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson, greeting the visiting editors, said much progress has been made by agriculture during the last 2 years in adjusting from wartime to peacetime conditions.

He said there have been fewer dislocations and hardships than ever before in a like period. But the Nation still faces a serious problem in adjusting wheat production and surpluses to their normal levels, Benson added.

The editors heard discussions of other phases of the Department by officials.

Those attending the meeting included: Robert C. Bjorklund, Wisconsin State Journal; Rex B. Conn, Cedar Rapids Gazette; Bill Durham, Star-Telegram, Fort Worth, Tex.; Hal M. Herd, Nashville Tennessean; Dave Hess, Cincinnati Enquirer; Bill Humphries, News and Observer, Raleigh, N. C.; and others.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is interesting to note that the same story which predicts a 40-percent rise in farm income also states:

Nathan Koffsky, chief of the farm income branch, told a meeting of the Newspaper Farm Editors Association that the income of the Nation as a whole will be 50 to 60 percent higher 20 years from now if present trends continue.

I want that particular statistical fact to be clear in our minds. The total income in the Nation will be from 50 to 60 percent higher, but the agricultural income will be about 40 percent higher. What does that indicate? It indicates clearly and unmistakably that there is a continuing falling off of agricultural income. That is one of the reasons the junior Senator from Minnesota has believed, and continues to believe, that we must take a brandnew look—to use some good administration phraseology—at the critical agricultural problem, and particularly at the problem of low farm income. We must not only take a new look, but we must also take some action.

I am pleased to be able to report to the Senate that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has now decided to hold hearings on proposed price-support legislation and other proposed legislation affecting the price level of agricultural commodities.

It ought to be crystal clear that no one seems to be very happy or satisfied with the present agricultural act. The act is not doing what it was supposed to do, namely, raise prices and balance production. Production is still out of balance and prices are going down.

The only area of our economy which is suffering today, despite the so-called boom times in which we live, is the agricultural area of the American economy. While one should not ever pose as a prophet—and I do not pose as one—I believe it is fair to say that what we see today in terms of agriculture as related to the rest of the economy is very much what we saw some 25 years ago pertaining to agriculture and its relationship to the rest of the economy.

I repeat that the administration's farm program is having two results. It is aggravating the problems of production and reducing the price levels in the



market place for agricultural commodities. I am pleased that the Senate, as well as the House of Representatives, is concerning itself with this question. I predict, with a reasonable degree of certainty, that as a result of the hearings which now will be held by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, we will hear the views of the American farmer and those associated with him, and that they will tell the sad story of the breakdown in agricultural price levels and in the net income of the American farmer.

#### AGRICULTURAL SURPLUSES

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to say that one of the most disappointing developments of this year has been the failure of the Department of Agriculture and of the State Department to move the agricultural surpluses. Surely there is enough creative thinking in the United States and in our Government to figure out a way by which we can utilize the abundance of food and fiber in this Nation on a good, sound, economic, and humane basis. We have vast quantities of feed grains and vast quantities of wheat on hand. The people of the world need those surpluses, and the world markets are available. I regret to say that the food and the fiber are not being moved in the amounts they should be moved. We see example after example of that fact.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that within the past 6 months the fine little country of Norway has purchased 3 million tons of wheat from the Soviet Union primarily because our law provides that our surplus commodities must be shipped in American bottoms.

That fact has literally frustrated the entire movement of surplus commodities. Recently, Denmark, where there is a real need for American feed grains, which we have in abundance, found itself in the same situation. Unless we open up the present agricultural legislation and adopt a remedial amendment to the act, we will find that our program of disposal and sale of surplus commodities will be for all practical purposes obviated and denied.

If our merchant marine needs help—and I believe it does—we should give it help directly, not tie down a worthy program with an unworkable provision.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that we are literally losing the world markets for agricultural commodities because of the restrictive provisions in the law which make it literally unworkable.

Some of us in the Senate have suggested that immediate action be taken to remove from the market the pressures of the so-called surpluses of food and fiber. These surpluses hang over the market like the sword of Damocles. It is ready to fall and strike at any moment and it causes the market to be in economic uncertainty and to have the jitters.

One effective procedure would be to take some of the wheat, for example, and to process it into feed. I am referring to the low-grade wheat. Feed from that source should be made available to the drought areas of the United

States. That wheat could be processed into feed. I find that if approximately 3 million tons of wheat, which is a small amount for a great economy like ours, were so processed, we would literally remove the excess production from the American wheat market.

Furthermore, if we took a certain amount of the wheat and placed it in an international food arrangement, such as has been recommended by a number of Senators, we could stabilize the domestic market and add a degree of security and stability to the international market.

I have spoken on this subject today because for some reason or other there seems to be a note of silence on this crucial issue. I do not intend to stand idly by or to hush my tongue on a matter so important as this as long as there is human suffering in the world, about which we are not doing anything, so long as there are markets in the world into which we are not selling, and so long as there is a depressed economic market at home, about which we are doing little or nothing.

#### RELAXATION OF INTERNATIONAL TENSIONS

From all I can read and hear, we are going to enter into a period where there may be some relaxation of international tensions. We are looking forward to what we call the meeting of the Big Four, the heads of state of the United States of America, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union. The American people are hoping and praying that this meeting will result in some constructive act for peace and tranquility; at least, that it will bring about an easing of the international tension. I also am looking forward to such a result, and I have faith in those representing our country who are going to attend the meeting. I am not one who feels that the President of the United States, or whomever he may take with him, would knowingly, willingly, or in any other way do anything that would not protect the honor of the United States. I am happy that there are people in high places who are desirous of seeking peace on sensible terms.

But the truth is, Mr. President, that we have now entered upon a period in which the strategy of great powers is involved. I think we must be sure of several things. First of all, we must be sure that we are strong militarily, without talking about it and without brandishing a club, without frightening friend and foe alike. Let us be calm in our courage and in our strength. In so doing, I think we will present to the world a Nation that is fearless. I think we sometimes exhibit too much concern and too much fear of the Soviet Union.

Let us realize our own strength and realize it with calm assurance of the power of our great productive system and the world's finest political and economic system. When we realize these things we will not enter into any conference with a spirit of fear. Fear always has a way of destroying one's strength and of immobilizing one's effectiveness.

So I hope, Mr. President, that we shall enter upon every negotiation in a spirit of confidence supported by facts.

Furthermore, I am convinced that for a period of time we are going to be called upon to test our system, our heritage, and our principles. For the past 10 years we have had to build up our armed strength again. We have been confronted with threats of violence and open warfare. The United States of America is not a warrior at heart. We are essentially soldiers of peace. We are essentially citizens in the best sense of that term. I think we are now going to have an opportunity really to demonstrate what our way of life means, if we are willing to apply ourselves to it.

I have said a number of times that we may well be in for a period of free time, so to speak, or extra time, in which to reevaluate the world scene. But time is a meaningless word unless we use it. The real issue is: Who will use this time and for what purpose? If there should be a relaxation of world tensions, will world communism use the time to promote its diabolical system of conspiracy, or will we use the time more effectively to wage a successful political offensive, telling the true story of democratic life, and will we use the time to strengthen the areas of the world which are still struggling for their independence? Will we use the time for training students among the free nations of the world, and to promote world trade, and strengthen the basic foundation of commerce in the world? Will we use the time that may be available to us to set a new high moral standard in international politics around which men and women of good faith can rally? Will we use the time to strengthen the United Nations? Will we use the time to find new friends in the areas of Asia and Africa? That is the issue. What will we do with the time which may be made available, God's will permitting, if the conferences are successful?

Surely, Mr. President, the Soviet Union is much weaker than we are, if we truly appraise the facts. I think we have a tendency to overestimate her power. At least, we have had a tendency to overestimate the attractiveness of what she has to offer. I think the time is now at hand for a great political, economic, and psychological offensive on the part of the United States and our allies. Let us strengthen and firm up the great Nation that is ours. Let us be very, very careful that we do not in any way relinquish the principles in which we believe—self-determination, independence, freedom, and equality for peoples everywhere in the world where our programs and policies may be placed into effect.

Mr. President, I listened with keen attention to the report of the Secretary of State, presented on television and radio, following his visit to Paris and to Vienna. I commended the Secretary of State on that report, because I thought it was temperate; I thought it was moderate; and I am happy to state from my own observation that I think the Secretary was careful in his reference to hopes he had that might not be realized. In other words, he was a cautious diplomat, and he gave a cautious and prudent report.

If I have any observation to make—and I do not wish it to be critical, but

I make it merely as an observation—it is that for 5 months the American people have had their eyes focused upon the Far East, and now, literally, as if we turned off the lights in one room and turned them on in another room, our attention is focused entirely on Central and Western Europe. Strange as it may seem, the Soviet Union was able to divert our attention almost instantly from the Far East, from Formosa, Asia, the Bandung conference, to Vienna, Austria. The Soviet did seize the initiative, but we are delighted that there is a treaty of independence with Austria. The Senate will have an opportunity to examine it, and, I am convinced, will ratify it. From all I have heard, at least, the treaty is reasonable and fair to the Austrians and in no way violates the principles to which this country adheres.

But, Mr. President, I wish to warn my colleagues—and I say this from personal conviction and personal observation—that communism is a worldwide apparatus which works all dimensions, all areas, at the same time. We Americans are prone to look at one area at a time. We are prone to examine one room of the world, so to speak, at a time. I suggest that we must not have a parochial or provincial attitude. We must be willing to look at the total world scene at one time and be able to make value judgments as we go along.

Let us not have our attention entirely focused on the European area now as we had it entirely focused for a while on the Asian areas a few months ago. Let us keep an eye on both the east and the west. Let us keep our eye on Formosa, Indochina, Afghanistan, India, Vietnam, and remember that those areas are of crucial importance. It may very well be that the Communists are hoping that by political action, with no violence and no war, we will relax and lull ourselves into a false sense of security, and that those areas will fall into the Soviet sphere. Let us see to it that those areas of the world remain within the area of freedom.

Mr. President, as I conclude this message, may I sound this note of warning, that the crucial issue in Western Europe is still Germany. I have stated on this floor not once but a dozen times that we must never forget that what the Soviet Union has in its mind most of all is a neutral Germany which will not participate in the Western defense collective security system. We must have the courage to make certain that that does not happen. I am hopeful that the comment which was made by our Chief Executive in a recent press conference—I believe it was on yesterday—will not be interpreted to mean that the United States of America would settle for a kind of neutral Germany.

I recall that the President was asked about the so-called neutrality of Austria, and he remarked that Austria is not a neutral in the sense of having no armed strength; but that Austria is a neutral like Sweden and Switzerland; a neutral which has armament to protect itself, and a nation which will protect itself.

The Soviet Union was very careful to let that happen. The Soviet Union could have prevented it from happening. I

say that if that is the principle which is to be applied to a unified Germany, it will mean that Germany will be in a central position to play off the East from the West.

Mr. President, we must make certain that Germany remains within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We must make certain that Germany's orientation is to the areas of freedom. We cannot run the risk of having a powerful Germany, in the role of a neutral, play off the East from the West.

I serve a solemn note of warning that in any negotiations which may occur in the months ahead, what happens in Germany will be of crucial importance to the American people. Therefore, let us strengthen in every way we can the ties of friendship between ourselves and the Federal Republic of West Germany. Let us make it crystal clear that we will not bargain away Western European collective security in the name of some kind of newfangled neutralism. This could be the issue which might well determine the developments of the future.

I rise to say this today because it is on my heart. I think we ought to speak aloud and use every opportunity to discuss these matters while there is still time for reasonable men to have honest discussion and even honest dissent.

#### REGULATION OF SUBSISTENCE EXPENSES AND MILEAGE ALLOWANCES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 352, Senate bill 1580.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1580) to regulate subsistence expenses and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on line 7, to strike out "\$13" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$12."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "\$13" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$12."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In justification of the amendment, I may say that the military pay bill, which has been previously acted upon by Congress, provided a maximum of \$12. It is the belief of the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and of other members of the committee which handled the proposed legislation that there should be a uniform per diem allowance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the report of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report (No. 348) is as follows:

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1580) to regulate subsistence expenses and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment, and recommend that the bill do pass.

#### PURPOSE

S. 1580 would amend sections 3 and 4 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949 (5 U. S. C. 836-837) to raise the maximum allowable per diem rate for travel within the Continental United States from \$9 to \$13, and the maximum mileage rates, for the use of privately owned motorcycles and automobiles, from 4 and 7 cents to 6 and 10 cents, respectively.

#### JUSTIFICATION

The existing maximum per diem allowance for civilian employees while traveling within the limits of the United States is limited to \$9 by the Travel Expense Act of 1949. The rate of \$13 provided by this enactment is based on an allowance of \$7.30 for hotel room, \$4.50 for meals, and \$1.20 for incidental expenses. These amounts are based upon the following:

Hotel costs: A large hotel accounting firm found, upon a study of room rates of 375 hotels used by businessmen in traveling, that the average room rate for a single room during 1954 was \$7.30.

Cost of meals: The allowance of \$4.50 is based upon a similar study and allocates \$1 for breakfast, \$1.25 for luncheon, and \$2.25 for dinner. Two hotel accounting firms report that the price of hotel and restaurant meals has increased not less than 20 percent since 1949.

Incidental expenses: The \$1.20 for incidentals is intended to cover such items of expense as tips and fees while traveling, hotel tips, tips to waiters, laundry, cleaning and pressing, telegrams for room reservations, etc.

#### COST

The Bureau of the Budget estimates the total additional cost of this bill will not exceed a maximum of \$30 million a year and its actual cost may be several million dollars a year less.

#### AGENCY REPORTS

Following are agency reports on S. 1580 as introduced and reported:

#### EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,

#### BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,

Washington, D. C., April 14, 1955.

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,

Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This will acknowledge your letter of April 1, 1955, inviting the Bureau of the Budget to comment on S. 1580, to regulate subsistence expenses and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government.

In his message to the Congress on Federal personnel management the President stated that a legislative proposal would be submitted for an appropriate increase in the per diem allowance for civilian employees who travel on official business. On March 8 the Bureau of the Budget transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House a draft bill which would carry out the President's recommendation. Copies of this correspondence, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, are enclosed for your information.

Briefly, the Bureau's bill proposes that the maximum per diem travel allowance be increased from \$9 to \$13; that special provision be made for unusual types of travel where



the maximum rate would be much less than the necessary actual expenses incurred; that present mileage allowances remain unchanged; that the maximum per diem allowance for civilians performing work for the Government without compensation be increased from \$10 to \$15; and that the travel rates for civilian employees who travel as witnesses on behalf of the United States be governed by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, rather than by separate legislation.

These proposed amendments were developed after extensive study and consultation with the major agencies of the Government. It is suggested that if your committee plans to take up legislation amending the Travel Expense Act, consideration be given to the changes proposed by the Bureau's bill.

Sincerely yours,

PERCIVAL F. BRUNDAGE,  
Acting Director.

UNITED STATES CIVIL  
SERVICE COMMISSION,  
Washington, D. C., May 10, 1955.

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,  
Chairman, Committee on Post  
Office and Civil Service,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: This is in further reply to your letter of April 1, 1955, requesting the views of the Civil Service Commission on S. 1580, a bill to regulate subsistence expenses and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government.

Section 2 of the bill would increase the maximum per diem allowance from \$9 to \$13 for Federal civilian employees who travel on official business within the limits of the continental United States. Section 3 would increase from 4 cents per mile to 6 cents per mile the allowance to employees for use of their privately owned motorcycles, and from 7 cents per mile to 10 cents per mile for use of their privately owned automobiles or airplanes, when traveling on official business.

On March 8, 1955, the Bureau of the Budget submitted to the Congress a legislative proposal which, among other things, would increase the maximum per diem allowance from \$9 to \$13 for civilian employees who travel on official business within the limits of the continental United States. A study by the Bureau of the Budget indicated such an increase was warranted on the basis of average hotel room rates, the increased price of hotel restaurant meals, and the increased cost of incidental expenses. The Commission endorses this provision of S. 1580.

The administration's legislative proposal recommends against any increase in mileage allowances to employees for use of privately owned vehicles while traveling on official business. No change in the present allowances was found to be justified on the basis of cost figures for the operation of automobiles, and the average mileage allowances most commonly used by private companies which compensate their employees on a flat mileage basis for use of personal cars on company business. The Commission does not favor section 3 of S. 1580.

The administration's legislative proposal also recommends three other changes in the present travel allowances. They are: (1) a special provision for unusual types of travel where the maximum rate would be much less than the necessary actual expenses incurred; (2) an increase from \$10 to \$15 in the maximum per diem allowance for employees serving without compensation; and (3) that travel rates for civilian employees who travel as witnesses on behalf of the United States be governed by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, rather than by separate legislation.

Because S. 1580 does not carry out all the recommendations contained in the admin-

istration's legislative proposal, we strongly recommend favorable action on the draft bill submitted to the Congress on March 8, 1955, instead of S. 1580.

We are advised that the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the submission of this report.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,  
PHILIP YOUNG, Chairman.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF  
THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, April 19, 1955.

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,  
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and  
Civil Service,  
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your letter of April 1, 1955, acknowledged by telephone April 6, enclosing copies of S. 1580, 84th Congress, and requesting our report and comments thereon.

The bill would amend sections 3 and 4 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 166). Specifically, the maximum allowable per diem rate for travel within the continental United States would be raised from \$9 to \$13, and the maximum mileage rates, for the use of privately owned motorcycles and automobiles, from 4 and 7 cents to 6 and 10 cents, respectively.

With respect to the maximum per diem rate contemplated by the bill, upon the basis of recent experiences by employees of our Office the existing maximum rate of \$9 is inadequate. We have found generally that our employees are required to expend approximately \$12 per day for suitable lodging, meals, and additional necessary subsistence expenses incident to official travel. We recognize, however, that governmentwide experience may reflect a need for a maximum per diem of \$13. Accordingly, it is recommended that section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949 be amended by eliminating the figure "\$9" and substituting either "\$12" or "\$13" in lieu thereof, as the overall facts presented to your committee may warrant.

Concerning the proposed increased mileage rates for the use of privately owned motorcycles and automobiles, there is no information available here relative to the necessity therefor.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,  
Comptroller General of the United States.

#### CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

#### "SECTIONS 3 AND 4 OF THE TRAVEL EXPENSE ACT OF 1949

"SEC. 3. Civilian officers and employees of the departments and establishments (except justices and judges covered by section 456 of title 28 of the United States Code), while traveling on official business and away from their designated posts of duty, shall be allowed, in lieu of their actual expenses for subsistence and all fees or tips to porters and stewards, a per diem allowance to be prescribed by the department or establishment concerned, not to exceed the rate of [\$9] \$13 within the limits of the continental United States and in case of travel beyond the limits of the continental United States not to exceed rates established by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for the locality in which the travel is performed: *Provided*, That such civilian officers and employees who become incapacitated due to illness or injury, not due to their own misconduct, while traveling on official business and away from

their designated posts of duty, shall be allowed such per diem allowances, and transportation expenses to their designated posts of duty, in accordance with regulations promulgated and approved under this act.

"SEC. 4. Civilian officers or employees of departments and establishments or others rendering service to the Government shall, under regulations prescribed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and whenever such mode of transportation is authorized or approved as more advantageous to the Government (except that no determination of advantage is required where payment on a mileage basis is limited to the cost of travel by common carrier, including per diem), be paid in lieu of actual expenses of transportation not to exceed [4] 6 cents per mile for the use of privately owned motorcycles, or [7] 10 cents per mile for the use of privately owned automobiles or airplanes, when engaged on official business within or outside their designated posts of duty or places of service. In addition to the mileage allowances provided for in this section, there may be allowed reimbursement for the actual cost of ferry fares, and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I understand why the reduction has been made from \$13 to \$12. So far as I am concerned, as chairman of the committee, and only as the chairman—I have not had time to discuss the matter with all the members of the committee—it is perfectly agreeable to reduce the amount, so as to make it uniform throughout the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1580) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That this act may be cited as the "Travel Expense Act of 1955."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of the act of June 9, 1949 [5 U. S. C. 836-837] is amended by striking the figure "\$9" and inserting "\$12" in lieu thereof.

SEC. 3. Section 4 of said act is amended by striking the figures "4 cents" and "7 cents" and inserting "6 cents" and "10 cents", respectively, in lieu thereof.

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect no later than 30 days following its enactment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in view of the action taken on Senate bill 1580, Calendar No. 352, I ask that Calendar No. 357, Senate bill 1795, which treats with the same subject, be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1795 is indefinitely postponed.

#### FEDERAL - AID ROAD - CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1048) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1911 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, do I understand correctly that Senate bill 1048, the Federal-aid road bill, is the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senate bill 1048 is the unfinished business; it was not displaced by the bill just passed.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRESS IN THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, fewer than 10 bills are on the Legislative Calendar. As a result of the cooperation of all Members of the Senate, it has been possible to pass promptly measures which have been thoroughly considered and recommended to the Senate by the committees.

If the chairmen of committees have any important or necessary measures ready for consideration and will report them to the Senate, the Senate will be in a position to consider them.

All the bills which are still on the calendar are there because certain Members did not care to have them acted on at this time.

I hope the committees will take notice of the status of the calendar and, when possible, will make prompt reports on items of proposed legislation.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF STATEMENTS BY GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL AND ROBERT SCHUMANN AP- PROVING THE PROPOSAL FOR A CONVENTION OF NATO NATIONS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I listened with much interest to the excellent address delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. I agree with him fully on the two principal points he made, namely, that it is necessary for the United States to strengthen and firm up the great alliance which is ours, and also that all means, political and economic, which are feasible and proper for the purpose of keeping the Federal Republic of West Germany in the orbit of the United States should be adopted by the United States Government. It is in connection with those general matters that I also wish to speak this afternoon.

I want to advise the Senate of statements made yesterday and today by two of the world's most honored men—men who during their lifetime have made monumental contributions to the Western alliance which seeks to preserve freedom and individual liberty.

I have here the statement of Gen. George C. Marshall, who led this Nation in war, and then, as Secretary of State, gave to the world the great and imaginative program known as the Marshall plan. I shall read General Marshall's words:

A few days before the death of Justice Owen J. Roberts, I accepted his invitation of May 5 to become a member of the Council of the Atlantic Union Committee which he has headed since its foundation in 1949. In accepting I wrote him May 12:

"I am honored to be counted among those who support the unity of free nations."

Justice Roberts' services to defense as well as to the judiciary were manifold, but perhaps the finest thing he did was the sacri-

fice he made in resigning from the Supreme Court to devote himself to the cause of Atlantic Union.

The subject today is vitally important and the period fateful. All probably agree to the importance of Atlantic unity but few act.

Recently a resolution calling for action was introduced in Congress by a distinguished bipartisan group from both Houses. It proposes that delegates from the United States and other NATO democracies meet in a convention "to explore and report to what extent their peoples might further unite within the framework of the United Nations, and agree to form, federally or otherwise, a defense, economic and political union." This prudent proposal, which commits us only to exploration, deserves support.

Thinking back on the development of our own Federal Union—on the doubts and difficulties which preceded the final union of the Colonies, on the remarkable advance in freedom, invention, production, and living standards which followed on the solution of the early difficulties, and on the high degree to which the States have continued to maintain their individual personality and institutions—Americans should have a sympathetic understanding of this effort to overcome the limitations of national barriers in the approach to a solution for common problems.

What I said when I addressed the Conference of Governors on July 14, 1947, I would repeat today: "There is no blinking the fact that this country now stands at a turning point in its relations to its traditional friends among the nations of the old world."

Either it must finish the task of assisting these countries to adjust themselves politically to the changed demands of a new age, or it must reconcile itself to seeing them move in directions which are consistent neither with their own traditions nor with those of this country. Whatever course is adopted will affect the lives and fortunes of people in every State of the Union.

I have just received the text of a statement made today by Robert Schumann, Minister of Justice in the present French Cabinet, who gave the world the Schumann plan for European Union. This is Mr. Schumann's statement in full:

The setting up of an exploratory committee (Comité d'Etude) regarding Atlantic union which is advocated at present in the United States Congress by so many distinguished Senators and Representatives, is of the highest importance to all nations belonging to NATO.

I have long been an ardent partisan of a European federation to be integrated itself in the Atlantic community. But certain European nations have hesitated to advance far in this direction so long as the United States, Canada, and Great Britain were not disposed to explore in common with them an eventual political, economic, and military union.

If the American Congress accepts the Atlantic proposal of Senator KEFAUVER, all the democratic European nations should be happy to accept the invitation to send delegates to such a study commission. Should there result from the work of this conference and from later proposals the outline of an acceptable plan of union, in which each of the member nations would be attributed an equitable voting right protecting it from any eventual domination by a single nation—which would be contrary to the democratic ideal of the union—we would then certainly have made a great step toward world peace and general prosperity.

In connection with these two statements by leaders on both sides of the Atlantic, I want to make it quite plain that they are entirely independent state-

ments. Neither General Marshall nor Mr. Schumann knew of the other's action.

What we see here, Mr. President, at this great moment in world history, is a remarkable coincidence of events and views on both sides of the Atlantic, as we have previously seen in history an awakening to great events which foreshadow a new progress in men's ability to live together in liberty and peace.

It seems to me that events are moving very rapidly in that direction today. On last February 9, along with 14 of my colleagues in the Senate, I submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, the resolution which both General Marshall and Mr. Schumann discussed. That resolution requested the President to invite the other democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates to an exploratory convention to explore and report "to what extent their peoples might further unite within the framework of the United Nations, and agree to form, federally or otherwise, a defense, economic, and political union."

Since I offered that resolution, we have seen Germany added to NATO. We have seen the Paris agreements ratified. We have seen an Austrian treaty move much closer to adoption. We have seen scheduled a four-power conference, and we have noted the exchanges of armament control plans.

While I know of no reason now for delaying action on this resolution, it does seem to me that there are several reasons why there should be hearings, followed by favorable action. And I would observe that the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. GEORGE] has informed me that he hopes the committee can give consideration to this resolution when the mutual-security program has been disposed of.

The Soviet treaty proposal to Austria is interpreted by many as a move toward neutralizing the Germans. To offset it, as the Senator from Minnesota has said, we need to make this move toward closer Atlantic unity, which will reassure both French and Germans that their future lies in the Atlantic community. The fact that the administration feared the earlier action on the Atlantic resolution would lead the French and Germans to defer ratification of the London-Paris accords, because they would much prefer an Atlantic union, speaks for itself as to the great hope that this resolution can rouse, and of the timely service it can perform in speeding German rearmament and binding all Western Europe firmly to us.

Furthermore, as a result of the Paris agreements, we are allowing the rearming of the Germans without taking the precaution of at least trying to unite the West into an economic and political community which would make remote the possibility of a rise of another Hitler. The Germans have made great progress in rebuilding their nation, and it is apparent that the hope of their distinguished leaders and of the people themselves is to become a contributing and permanent part of the West. They cannot take the position of which they are



capable, however, by a military alliance alone, just as none of the other nations can contribute fully by military alliances alone. There must be means of economic, political, and foreign policy consultations and unity. If we can make this possible, then we will have achieved the dreams of peace-loving men for centuries.

Moreover, I believe it will be agreed that the Kremlin's strategy in the Big Four talks will be to try to divide us from the British and French. It would seem wise to guard now against this by having the proposed nondiplomatic convention called to explore strong Atlantic unity. The United States hand at the Big Four meeting would be greatly strengthened by this display of unity and by the knowledge Moscow would have that its efforts at division were doomed to frustration.

Mr. President, conventions such as the one I have proposed, outside of diplomatic channels, have an impressive record of achievement. It is not unlike the procedure followed by our Government in 1947 in naming committees of distinguished citizens to advise us freely on the problems that we faced then—a procedure that resulted in the establishment of the Marshall plan. We should never be loath to encourage meeting of representative citizens.

There is nothing revolutionary about my proposal. It is simply in the best traditions of our Nation. I sincerely hope that with the support of such distinguished world leaders as General Marshall and Mr. Schumann, and with the support of thousands of our own fellow citizens, this resolution will receive the Senate's blessing, and the President will call the convention.

#### CROOKED RIVER PROJECT NEEDED BY CENTRAL OREGON

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, last week the Bureau of Reclamation proposed construction of a new irrigation project in the State of Oregon. The new unit—called the Crooked River project—calls for the use of power revenues from the Dalles Dam, an unrelated Federal project, to pay part of the construction costs.

I support the Bureau's plan for use of power revenues to help finance the Crooked River project, despite the opposition voiced recently by Gov. Paul Patterson, of Oregon.

Despite the objections of Oregon's Governor, I will make every effort to hasten legislative action on this proposal, which will create new farming opportunities in my home State and will improve the water supply of farmers now facing shortages.

Opposition by the Oregon Governor to using power revenues as an aid to irrigation reflects an extremely shortsighted viewpoint. Farmers cannot carry the full burden of repayment for the remaining undeveloped reclamation projects in Oregon. Only high-cost projects remain, and unless assistance is obtained from power revenues, agricultural expansion in Oregon has about reached the end of the line.

The Oregon Governor's opposition first became known to me at the hearings conducted by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in Portland, Oreg., last April 6. At that time, Governor Patterson said he was opposed to use of power revenues from dams to help pay for irrigation projects to which they are not physically related. I asked Governor Patterson specifically about power-revenue assistance for the Crooked River project, and he replied that he was opposed to such aid to irrigation.

I was amazed that the chief executive of my home State would take such a position. Adoption of the Oregon Governor's policy would end our hopes for more irrigation in eastern Oregon.

The timing of the Governor's statement was noteworthy because a concerted drive is now on to discredit full use of water resources for additional irrigation in the West. I believe that the enemies of irrigation are not taking sufficient note of our rising birth rate, and the problem it poses in relation to future food supplies. It appears likely that our population will reach 200 million by 1975. Today we farm about 365 million acres of land. This is about 40 million acres more than is needed to feed our Nation without exporting part of the farm output. The increased population by 1975 will require cultivation of a minimum additional eighty to one hundred million acres of new land to feed the hungry mouths of the expanded population.

I should like to point out that new irrigated land cannot be brought under cultivation overnight. The Crooked River project is not a project of vast proportions. It involves the investment of about \$6 million of Federal funds, and will irrigate about 10,000 acres of new land and provide additional water for 10,220 acres now inadequately irrigated. But it will require nearly 5 years from start of construction until water is delivered to the land.

History of reclamation in the West shows that it has come about as a result of joint development of water for irrigation and for hydroelectric power. Use of power revenues to aid irrigation goes back to the earliest projects of the Federal reclamation program. A financing method similar to that proposed for the Crooked River project was approved at the last session of Congress in connection with the Foster Creek irrigation project in the State of Washington. The same principle is proposed in our Hells Canyon bill to provide financial support for the Mountain Home project, if authorized by Congress. It is my belief that Governor Patterson's opposition represents a complete reversal of the tried and tested formula for development of the arid West.

I was glad to join with Oregon reclamation advocates in urging the Interior Department to approve use of some power revenues from the Dalles Dam for helping to support the Crooked River development.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks portions of the report of Wilbur A. Dexheimer, Commissioner of Reclamation, on the Crooked River project, which was approved by

Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay, and a resolution from the Crook County Farm Bureau, indicating the approval of members of that organization, many of whom own lands under the proposed project.

There being no objection, the report and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES,  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,  
Washington, D. C., March 11, 1955.  
The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

SIR: This is my proposed report on the potential Crooked River project, Oregon. It includes the accompanying February 12, 1953, report of the Regional Director, Boise, Idaho.

The physical plan presented in the regional director's report remains essentially unchanged. New information on costs, allocation of costs, and on repayment has been developed since completion of the regional director's report and is presented in an attachment to this letter.

The Crooked River project surrounds and is adjacent to the town of Pineville in Crook County of central Oregon. It would utilize the water resources of Ochoco Creek and the Crooked River, a tributary of the Deschutes River. A stable irrigation water supply would be provided for 9,990 acres of dry land and 10,220 acres of land now inadequately irrigated. These areas include 7,230 new acres and 7,660 presently inadequately irrigated acres within the Ochoco irrigation district and 5,320 acres of non-district land of which 2,760 would be classed as dry land and 2,560 as inadequately irrigated. In addition, 51,200 acre-feet of water annually would be available for future use on other acreage in the Deschutes River Basin. Flood control, drainage, recreation, and fish and wildlife benefits also would result from construction of the project works. Preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife are included among project purposes.

Normal annual precipitation for the project area is a little over 9 inches, about half of which falls from April through October. This semiarid condition restricts the agricultural use of land without irrigation. Since agriculture is one of the two main industries of the area it is most important that it be strengthened and expanded to assure an adequate economy especially if the other industry, lumbering, remains static or declines. Also, the project would afford a number of part-time farming opportunities for workers employed in local industries.

Frequently, as a result of rapid melting of snow, agricultural bottom lands and part of Pineville and its surrounding area are flooded and sometimes damaged seriously. The recently rehabilitated Ochoco Reservoir and the proposed Pineville Reservoir when operated in conjunction with each other would develop the available water resources for irrigation and would provide significant control of the floodwaters of Ochoco Creek and the Crooked River. Proposed drainage would greatly improve agricultural bottom lands.

The local people, recognizing these problems, have shown a great deal of interest in securing additional irrigation water and protection from spring floods, and are favorable to a Federal project. Construction of the project is economically justified in that the evaluated annual benefits exceed the estimated annual costs by the ratio of better than 2 to 1 based on a 50-year period of analysis. This benefit-cost ratio is based on the use of all water made available by the project. Considering direct benefits only, the ratio would be 1.25 to 1.

The estimated cost, based on October 1954 prices, of the new facilities that would

actually be constructed is \$6,339,000. This amount includes \$200,000 which represents costs of investigations up to the estimated date of initial construction and \$570,000 for drainage costs which reflect an increase of \$312,000 over the amount shown in the regional director's report. The new and additional annual operation, maintenance and replacement costs which would be necessary as a result of the new works are estimated at about \$38,800.

Tentative allocations of the \$6,598,000 based upon the separable costs—remaining benefits method, are as follows: reimbursable-irrigation \$5,903,000; nonreimbursable-flood control \$653,000. Specific costs, which would also be considered nonreimbursable, allocated to fish and wildlife and recreation are respectively \$29,000 and \$13,000. The latter amount is the cost of minimum recreation facilities at Prineville Reservoir which I recommend be constructed by the Federal Government on a nonreimbursable basis provided that a responsible State or local agency agrees to operate and maintain the completed facilities.

The annual amortization capacity of the Ochoco Irrigation district lands is approximately \$39,600. This is the net amount available for repayment purposes after deducting the annual operation, maintenance, and replacement costs of \$45,600, which includes about \$19,100 for existing works, from the annual payment capacity. In 50 years the water users could return \$1,980,000. This would repay the cost of the bonds, cost of Ochoco Dam rehabilitation, and \$1,363,000 toward the cost of new works and the Cove Powerplant installation. This would leave unpaid a balance of \$2,171,000 of the costs allocated to the Ochoco irrigation district lands.

The annual repayment ability or amortization capacity of nondistrict lands is estimated to be about \$15,500 which is more than adequate to repay the \$515,000 allocated to these lands in 50 years.

Investigations to date indicate that the potential uses of water in the Deschutes River Basin far exceed available supply. The excess water of the Crooked River project could be used in several localities within the basin and full development of the Prineville Reservoir site is considered fully justified.

For purposes of demonstrating repayment it was assumed that the excess water would be utilized by lands of the north unit of the Deschutes project. A pumping plant at the point on the Crooked River where the north unit main canal crosses, via a flume, would be necessary to furnish Crooked River water to the canal for delivery to the north unit lands. Such pumping plant would not actually be constructed as part of the Crooked River project but its estimated cost of \$777,000 is utilized in the studies to derive the total reimbursable cost that would be involved in applying the excess water to the north unit lands.

The total cost (\$2,631,000) would be the sum of the project cost (\$1,854,000) allocated to deferred acreage and the \$777,000 for the flume crossing pumping plant. Water users on the north unit could repay \$1,198,000 in 50 years in addition to meeting necessary additional annual O. M. & R. costs of \$37,500 leaving an unpaid balance of \$1,433,000. It is emphasized that the north unit lands are used for demonstrative purposes only and it is not intended to imply that the excess water would be committed to such lands.

The \$2,171,000 balance for the Ochoco irrigation district lands and the \$1,433,000 balance for the north unit lands, which are beyond the repayment ability of the respective water users, could be repaid by utilizing net surplus power revenues from one of the

Federal dams on the Columbia River under provisions similar to those applicable to the Foster Creek division, Chief Joseph Irrigation project, as authorized by act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 568). It is estimated that it would take only about 123 days (74 days for the district lands and 49 days for the non-project lands) for the net surplus power revenues of The Dalles project to repay these costs. With this aid all project costs allocated to the Ochoco irrigation district lands would be repaid within a 50-year period. Also, the costs allocated to lands to utilize the excess project water could be returned in 50 years after such water is put to beneficial use. I recommend, therefore, that the Crooked River project be authorized on the basis that net surplus power revenues from The Dalles project of the Corps of Engineers be utilized to return the reimbursable costs beyond the water users' ability to repay.

I recommend that you approve and adopt this report as your proposed report on the Crooked River project and that you authorize me, in your behalf, to transmit copies to the States of the Columbia River Basin and to the Secretary of the Army in accordance with requirements of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887), to the State of Oregon for the views and recommendations of the head of the agency exercising administration over the wildlife resources of the State in accordance with provisions of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080), and to other interested Federal agencies for their comments.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. DEXHEIMER,  
Commissioner.

CROOK COUNTY FARM BUREAU,  
Prineville, Oreg., May 13, 1955.

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,  
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. NEUBERGER: The Crook County Farm Bureau requests that favorable legislative action be enacted to authorize the Crooked River project, providing the final Bureau of Reclamation Crooked River project report contains the approximate below outlined provisions. We submit our recently enacted resolutions as follows:

"Whereas the possibility for early authorization of the Crooked River project seems possible, it appears reasonable that we, who own lands under this proposed project should make known our attitude.

"We would favor a contract under the following approximate conditions:

"Proposed dam to furnish all the irrigation water necessary to adequately irrigate all the irrigable lands under the proposed dam.

"The original plans to provide adequate facilities for doing this.

"The Ochoco project: The Ochoco Irrigation District management to continue with board of directors and manager as is now operated.

"Annual yearly repayment, including operation and maintenance, not to exceed approximately \$5.72 per acre per year.

"A sliding scale repayment contract, with less payment in poor income years. Farmers paying within their ability to pay, but not to exceed the approximate \$5.72 per acre per year. Payments to be for a period of 50 years, after which revenues from the Dalles Dam be applied to pay the balance.

"Lands now receiving Crooked River water—

"To retain their project's identities, water rights, and present methods of distribution and operation if they so choose.

"To purchase Crooked River stored water on a sliding-scale contract at a cost not to exceed approximately \$3.19 per acre per year.

"New lands not receiving either Ochoco or Crooked River water: To be included wherever economically feasible under a sliding scale repayment contract with the repayment period of 50 years, as shown above.

"Upstream rights and uses: The principles as outlined in the Bureau of Reclamation Crooked River report of February 1953, recognizing upstream water rights and potential requirements must be retained in line with the policy of looking toward ultimate basin development."

CROOK COUNTY FARM BUREAU,  
By ELDRED BREESE, Secretary.

## HELLS CANYON DAM ON OREGON-IDAHO BORDER NEEDED BY NORTHWEST

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the recent ruling by the Federal Power Commission examiner to turn over a portion of the Hells Canyon stretch of the Snake River to Idaho Power Co. has alarmed one of America's leading newspapers, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

I ask unanimous consent that a very cogent editorial from the Post-Dispatch of May 9, 1955, be printed in the body of the RECORD for the information of the Senate and the general public.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### HELLS CANYON'S NEW LOOK

The results of a year's hearings are in, and they give Secretary McKay ample cause for an agonizing reappraisal of his duty at Hells Canyon.

This waterpower site on the Snake River, a tributary of the Columbia, on the Idaho-Oregon border, is one of the richest remaining undeveloped in the Nation. It is situated in a region which has been held back by inadequate supplies of electric power, and which needs its waterpower potential developed to the maximum.

A high dam at Hells Canyon to achieve maximum development there was planned by the Reclamation Bureau of the Department of the Interior until Mr. McKay became Secretary. He then announced that he was relinquishing the site in favor of the Idaho Power Co. That private utility had applied to build two low dams, Brownlee and Hells Canyon, along the same stretch of river, with the possibility of building a third, Oxbow, at some later date.

It is this three-dam system whose merits a Federal Power Commission examiner has gone into, and compared with the originally proposed Bureau of Reclamation project, in hearings extending over a year.

Examiner William J. Costello now concludes in effect that the Federal project would be preferable if it were going to be built, but that it is not going to be built and therefore the Idaho power dam project is preferable.

On this line of reasoning, Henry Ford's plan for private exploitation of Muscle Shoals would have been preferable to TVA. But is it the FPC's job to estimate the political prospects of controversial projects? The real question for the FPC to decide is whether this finding follows the mandate laid by Congress upon the FPC to issue licenses only for projects best adapted to a comprehensive plan for improving or developing a waterway.

Of the three dams in the proposed Idaho Power System, the examiner recommends that the FPC license only Brownlee. FPC's legal staff had earlier recommended licensing of all three projects. Examiner Costello says the cost of producing power would be raised to more than 6 mills a kilowatt-hour if Ox-



bow and Hells Canyon were added to the Brownlee project. No market could reasonably be predicted for the power at so high a price, he says, and construction of the second and third dams is therefore "clearly not in the public interest." This despite the fact that "there is a crying need for firm-power additions in the Northwest."

Secretary McKay himself 2 years ago observed that the Northwest was "critically short of power." Arguing that the Idaho Power Co. project could begin overcoming that shortage sooner than the public project, he contended that the power generated at 3 low dams would be 87 percent of that generated at 1 high dam.

Now, however, Idaho Power's 3 low dams have shrunk to 1 low dam. And if only Brownlee Dam were built, in accordance with the examiner's recommendations, the amount of power realized from the Hells Canyon stretch of the Snake River would be only 40 percent of what 1 high-public dam would supply. If Brownlee were built, moreover, it would forever foreclose the high dam, by standing in the area which the latter's reservoir would have to occupy.

Is the Pacific Northwest—is the Nation—going to be content with less than halfway development of the rich and much-needed power potential at Hells Canyon?

Now that the allegations of fact on which Secretary McKay sought to justify his relinquishment of the site no longer apply, will the Secretary reinstate the Federal project, or will he insist on an extravagant waste of over half the usefulness of this great natural resource?

#### CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to inform the Senate that the conferees on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill are meeting; and I understand that it is quite possible that the conference report will be ready for consideration by the Senate either on tomorrow, Friday, or Monday. A conference report of course is a highly privileged matter; and I wish to state for the RECORD that it will be my purpose to notify the minority leader whenever the conference report is ready; and if the report is a unanimous one, I am sure he will concur in having it brought promptly before the Senate.

So I should like to have the Members of the Senate on notice that the Senate will consider the conference report on either the first or the second calendar day the Senate is in session, following today.

Mr. President, if there is nothing further to come before the Senate at this time—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). The present occupant of the chair knows of nothing.

#### RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now stand in recess.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 17 minutes) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, May 20, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 19 (legislative day of May 2), 1955:

##### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

William C. Farmer, of Kansas, to be United States attorney for the district of Kansas for the term of 4 years.

##### COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Marvin B. Miller to be ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective May 12, 1955, subject to qualifications provided by law.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 19, 1955

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, unto whom we are daily compelled and constrained to bring our finite minds and fallible judgments, and our sinful hearts to be pardoned and purified, may we enter upon the tasks of the day with confidence and courage.

Grant that in this time of darkness and shadows, when we wish that we might be able to see more clearly the events impending, may we surrender ourselves solely and supremely to the leading of Thy Spirit.

Inspire us with new ventures of faith and larger vistas of outlook as we labor together to break down the barriers that divide mankind and seek to build not only a world that is safe for democracy but a democracy that is safe for the world.

Help us to believe in the coming of a new social order, made nobler by the suffering and sacrifice and wiser by its folly and stupidity.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

#### ACTION OF STATE MEDICAL ASSOCIATION OF SOUTH DAKOTA ON POLIO VACCINE

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the medical associations of the 47 other States would do well to follow the example of the State medical association of South Dakota, who have pledged to the people of South Dakota and to the Nation that no needy child in that State will go without polio vaccine, whether the Federal Government intervenes or not.

A telegram addressed to me under date of May 18, 1955, from Dr. A. W. Spiry,

president, and John C. Foster, secretary of the SDMA, reads as follows:

No needy child in South Dakota will go without polio vaccine, whether Federal Government intervenes or not. Our doctors always have and will continue to care for all patients and needs. Polio hysteria is sometimes greater cause for alarm than polio itself. We urge careful consideration of procedure as to how Federal funds are allocated to needy.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you and to the membership of this Congress that this is a challenge to the medical associations of the other States. I hope they will follow the leadership of South Dakota.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 66]

Albert	Dondero	Macdonald
Avery	Doyle	Miller, N. Y.
Ayres	Eberharther	Morgan
Barrett	Edmondson	Morrison
Boggs	Fjare	Moulder
Bolton,	Gamble	Mumma
Frances P.	Gathings	O'Konski
Bolton,	Gray	Pillion
Oliver P.	Gregory	Reed, N. Y.
Buckley	Hébert	Scherer
Burleson	Herlong	Short
Canfield	Heslton	Tollefson
Celler	Hillings	Walter
Christopher	Kearney	Williams, N. Y.
Colmer	Kearns	
Dingell	Lesinski	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 391 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### NATIONAL RESERVE PLAN

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5297) to provide for the strengthening of the Reserve forces, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5297, with Mr. TRIMBLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, section 3 of the bill had been read.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 3, line 4, after the period, strike out all